
PERSONAL RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

W. A. HARPER

230
H234p

Best wishes

Mrs. M. F. Coffin

Oct. 6, 1937

PERSONAL RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

le, No. 1 8118



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

230
H 234 P

PERSONAL RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

BY

W. A. HARPER, Litt.D., LL.D.

*Professor of Religious Education,
Vanderbilt School of Religion*



BOSTON

The Christopher Publishing House
Boston, U. S. A.

COPYRIGHT, 1937
BY THE CHRISTOPHER PUBLISHING HOUSE

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TO
REV. CULLEN T. CARTER
PRESIDING ELDER, PULASKI DISTRICT, METHODIST
EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH, PRINCE AMONG
LEADERSHIP EDUCATORS, AT WHOSE SUGGESTION
THE ORIGINAL COURSE LEADING TO THIS BOOK
WAS GIVEN.

FOREWORD

Beginning at 8 P. M. Saturday, October 3, 1936 and continuing each Saturday evening at the same hour through December 26, for fifteen minutes each night, WSIX broadcast a Leadership Education Course, with the undersigned as speaker or leader. The course was entitled, "My Christian Beliefs" and is reproduced just as given over the radio in the pages that follow. It had previously been given under different titles and with variant content in more than a dozen places.

It was a new departure in Leadership Education, but judged by the favorable comments that came to the leader, the individual lectures were quite well received. No doubt a public accustomed to such courses over radio, would have sent in problems to be presented by the leader, and this would have made the process more nearly creative. The twelve topics with the two questions given on both the Saturday evening preceding the lecture and repeated before the lecture on the eve of its delivery are herewith listed as follows:

I. WHAT IS PERSONAL RELIGION?

1. What is religion?
2. In what way will rethinking our religion tend to make it personal?

II. HOW SHALL WE THINK ABOUT GOD?

1. How have men conceived of God?
2. How can we know God?

III. HOW SHALL WE UNDERSTAND JESUS?

1. What did Jesus teach?
2. How did His life express His teaching?

IV. DO WE NEED THE HOLY SPIRIT IN OUR RELIGION?

1. How can we know the Holy Spirit?
2. How can a monotheist believe in the Trinity?

V. HOW SHALL WE REGARD MAN?

1. What is Man?
2. How does Christianity regard Man?

VI. DOES MAN NEED SALVATION?

1. What is conversion?
2. What is Christian nurture?

VII. HOW WAS THE WORLD CREATED?

1. What do we mean by creation?
2. What is the Christian view of the world?

VIII. DO WE NEED THE CHURCH?

1. What are the nature and function of the Church?
2. How is the Church related to sectarianism?

IX. OF WHAT VALUE IS THE BIBLE?

1. How is the Bible God's Word?
2. How shall we use the Bible?

X. IS CHRISTIANITY THE FINAL RELIGION?

1. Upon what principles must the final religion rest?
2. Under what conditions may Christianity become the final religion?

XI. DOES DEATH END ALL?

1. What are the arguments for and against belief in immortality?
2. What does Christianity have to say with reference to the question, Does this life end spiritual development?

XII. DO WE NEED A PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE?

1. Contrast the Christian and Pagan Philosophies of life.
2. How does philosophy become personal religion?

What follows is the course as given on successive Saturday evenings, as we have said, though the inaugurating lecture given on October 3 is omitted. It is hoped that the reading of these lectures may serve to quicken interest in Leadership Education, a lamentable need of our present-day religious education forces, and lead to consistent thinking on the several items of the faith we cherish. Each Christian has his theology, though he may not call it by that name. The author in these pages sets forth his present Christian beliefs.

In the appendix is given a list of books bearing on each topic presented. It is hoped that these sources will be consulted before the particular chapter is read in each instance, so that the reader may not be too much influenced in his judgment by the leader's point of view.

There is no question that radio offers a real opportunity in Leadership Education, and it is hoped that the opportunity will be seized upon and utilized to the full.

W. A. Harper.

Vanderbilt University,
Easter, 1937.

CONTENTS

Foreword	7
I What is Personal Religion?	13
II How Shall We Think About God?	21
III How Shall We Understand Jesus?	27
IV Do We Need the Holy Spirit in Our Religion?	33
V How Shall We Regard Man?	41
VI Does Man Need Salvation?	47
VII How Was the World Created?	54
VIII Do We Need Church?	62
IX Of What Value is the Bible?	72
X Is Christianity the Final Religion?	81
XI Does Death End All?	92
XII Do We Need a Philosophy of Life?	100
Appendix	111

Personal Religious Beliefs

I

WHAT IS PERSONAL RELIGION?

General Statement

The discussion that follows as well as that in connection with each subject treated is to be taken also as source material for the solution of the problems and issues arising out of the consideration of the particular topic. It is in no sense to be regarded as final nor to be used as authoritative in the ordinary meaning of the term, but it is hoped it will be suggestive to the earnest seeker after truth. The discussion in each case represents the speaker's thinking to date frankly stated, based on his personal experience, the reading of much source material, and not a little reflective thought. The direct method of the radio presentation accounts for certain departures from the literary style.

As a witness to the truth as it appears to one mind, the discussion may, it is hoped, be valuable in arriving at helpful conclusions, understanding of course, that all conclusions are tentative and subject to continuous revision as experience widens and insights deepen. The truth that frees, goes marching on. It is a discovery, a questing, not a deposit. "The truth shall make you free," said Jesus. He also said—"I have yet many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now."

It is hoped that the alert reader will consult the list of sources given in the appendix but particularly the Bible references in connection with each topic before making up his mind on any theme presented in this discussion.

What Is Religion?

While our definitions of religion all may well vary, there are certain concepts that inhere in all of them and it is these concepts that really constitute religion. Underlying religion are the concepts that a power or force or energy or personality higher than man exists, that man realizes his insufficiency in the presence of this Power, that this Power is friendly to him, and that he inevitably reaches out toward it for help.

Historically speaking, men have always entertained these concepts and ordered their lives in terms of them. Their methods have varied as much as their definitions, and these various attempts to make these concepts function in living have given us the several religious systems of the world: Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Mohammedanism, Shintoism, Judaism, Christianity, and the rest, eleven of them living and many more dead. So we need never to apologize for our religious aspiration. It distinguishes men from the mineral, vegetable and animal orders of creation. These may have energy, may have life even, but they lack personal relationship with the divine.

The Origin of Religion

Is religion man-made, or is it the voice of God validated in experience and making clear His will and mind and purpose for men? The answer is, that it is both. God does speak to men, but not all men hear.

Man is a radio set, so to speak. God is the spiritual broadcaster. In order to get the message of the broadcast, we must tune in, and not every such set is tuned in because of the static on the line or for other reason. This, however, in no way disproves the fact that the very atmosphere is surcharged with spiritual messages. Then when the instrument of reception is properly tuned in, the listener-in is the responsible interpreter of the meaning of the message. God has never been without interpreters in any age.

We cannot too strongly insist on the validity of this principle. It means that personal values are the supreme values, and that the individual is personally responsible for his life. It means that religion is progressive, not static—faced forward and not backward. It also means that there is no realm of experience for which religion may not have a dynamic—that there is no experience that is incapable of religious significance—that whether we eat (cf. I Cor. 10, 31.) or drink or whatever we do, we should do it all to the glory of God. So is life hallowed. So shall the will of God be done in earth as it is in heaven. And so does religion become a way of life, not a body of doctrine to be intellectually assented to nor certain holy acts to be performed individually or socially. Religion thus becomes the servant of man's life, leading him by nobler and yet nobler endeavor to achieve the highest good for himself, his brother-man, the organized fellowship of the social order, and for God.

Religious Experience

Religion is related potentially to all life. No experience is devoid of religious significance. But when does

an experience become religious? Under what conditions does an experience pass from the stage of inherent religious significance to actual religious value?

In the beginning we must distinguish between events and experiences. Life may be defined as a train of events. These events are many of them solidified by habitual reactions. It is well that our reactions to life situations should in part become habitual, but should all reactions to such events become habitual, life itself would become static and incapable of progressive development. It is well, therefore, that certain events should be consciously attended to—that they should become experiences, in other words. That is to say, an experience is an event to which conscious effort is directed. These events toward which conscious effort is directed, are the guarantee of human progress, for out of them and the issues and problems they involve come the new meanings, the deeper appreciations, the higher values of living.

In order for such experiences, however, to yield their religious significance for man, they must be related to the ultimate personality of the universe, that is, to God. Manifestly then the conception that men entertain as to God, must have determinative influence over their life. As their conception of God varies, their reactions toward the experiences of life will correspondingly change. As Christians, not only our habitual reactions to passing events, but our conscious experiences must be related to God. We must be ready at any time to examine our habitual reactions to the events of life or our conscious reactions to the experiences of living in terms of God. When we do this we cause the inherent religious values to become actual spiritual forces. When an experience is thus interpreted in terms of our con-

ception of God, it yields its religious significance and becomes vitally religious.

Person, Personality, Character

It is difficult to define the term person, but really we know what we mean. A person, certain scientists and philosophers say, is a mechanism, capable of reaction, but bound by the conditions of the situation in which he is found, and so a person's conduct can be accurately predicted, if we know the complete situation. The personalistic concept of man is, however, quite different. According to this view, the person is not a mechanism, but an organism. He is not bound by circumstances, but has causal relations with them, and so is capable of free choice, which means that he is responsible morally and ethically for his conduct. No other order of being so far as we know except man has such responsibility. That man is such a person dignifies him and sets him off from God's other creatures and from the universe itself. This "person," this soul, is of such tremendous value according to the Christian teaching that it outweighs in ultimate worth all the material things of the world. And so the great Interpreter of the Christian way of life asks this trenchant question: "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" (cf. Mark 8, 36).

Is such a view of man as a person reasonable and tenable? Does science oppose it? Does history deny it? What is the witness of personal experience? Science has opposed it with its mechanistic view of life—whether it be one of the physical sciences or the science of psychology, sometimes defined as the science of human behavior. But the tide has turned and we now

find physicists saying that the atom is composed of electrons and protons moving at prodigiously rapid rates of speed and that *no one can predict in what direction an electron will move around its proton*. Physics, one of the physical sciences thus suggests a basis in the natural world for belief in the freedom of the will.

Sir James Jeans, a distinguished British Physicist* says: "The Universe shows evidence of a designing or controlling power that has *something in common with our own individual minds*—today there is a widespread agreement, which on the physical side of science amounts almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is heading toward a non-mechanical reality; *the universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine.*"

It appears reasonable intellectually and respectable scientifically, therefore, to believe in the independent existence of persons, free, identifiable, responsible, capable of knowing other persons and God, and of entering into relations with them. History and personal experience certainly support and validate such a view.

Personality we may define as the more or less stable organization, synthesis, or integration of the person's impulses, habits, attitudes, ideas, and sentiments taken in their total aspect, subject to modification and reorganization as new experiences and conditions are met. Personality is thus an achievement. It may also be conceived as the unity of the person's voluntary and habitual reactions to specific situations in the field of experience. When personality becomes integrated in terms of a standard, we have character. Character may therefore be defined as the ethical quality of human behavior.

**This Mystical Universe*, p. 158. Macmillan, 1930.

Making Our Religion Personal

Religion becomes truly personal only when it becomes a functional, dynamic, motivating force in life. The performance of worshipful or holy acts, the intellectual assent to bodies of doctrinal belief, do not necessarily make religion personal. These may serve merely to make religion beautiful, and reasonable, and perfunctory. It must become a controlling enrichment of life and conduct if it is truly personal. Personal religion so conceived makes very definite and extremely valuable contributions to character. It refines character. It idealizes it. It provides sanctions for the conduct. It motivates it. It dynamicizes it. It integrates it. But, sad to say, it sometimes dogmatizes it, and when it does it loses its other fine qualities and becomes a brake on the wheels of human progress.

Rethinking Our Religion

Every generation manifestly needs to think its religion and the implications of its religion through for itself. The age of the radio, the airplane, the quantum theory, and relativity certainly cannot be satisfied with the religious formulations of the days that preceded it. As knowledge advances and experiences widen, as more and more men become adept in "Thinking God's thoughts after Him," as Kepler so reverently expressed it, there will be need of orienting one's religious concepts and attitudes in the field of general understanding. It is no reflection on religion to insist that it too should make progress. We are under obligations to gain new insights into God's ways of dealing with men and of His ideals for them.

In conclusion, we must not accept any statement as satisfying our quest for the new light that should continually illumine our effort at making our religion personal, but must welcome such new light from any and every source, testing it always by the highest values we know, the values revealed in the finest life men have been privileged to cherish, the values exemplified in Jesus. Thus does religion become doubly personal. It satisfies our personal problems through relating us to the Ideal Person.

II

HOW SHALL WE THINK OF GOD?

Man's Need of God

All men are religious. For most men religion arises out of the sense of human insufficiency and leads to an outreaching to secure aid from the divine. Does this necessarily involve belief in God? Most of us would answer, yes, but some would respond, no. The atheist, or perhaps we had better say, the non-theist, however, feels his sense of insufficiency and trusts in nature or in the social relations of humanity to bring him the support he craves and must have, if he is to carry on.

Is There a God?

The question raised by Job—"Canst thou by searching find out God?" still requires a negative answer. It is still true that "no man hath seen God at any time." Nor can we prove the existence of God to anybody's satisfaction except our own, and to ourselves we do not need to prove it. We just know that He is and proceed to act on our conviction. This is the biblical way, where God is assumed and any man who thinks otherwise is regarded as a fool.

Yet there are cumulative arguments for the existence of God that have strengthened man's primary apprehension of Him and we should know what they are. There is first of all the argument from the existence

of the universe in all its beauty and orderliness. Surely such a world as we live in did not just happen. There must have been a cause. We may admit it and we do, but all we have by that accomplished is to suggest that a cause produced the universe. This does not entitle us to assign with confidence any particular qualities to this cause. Cosmic energy is a poor sort of God, yet that only is what we can claim from this ancient argument from orderliness in the cosmos. We are grateful for this much, but it does not satisfy the heart. It is not enough.

A second argument takes its origin from the evidence of design or purpose in the universe. That there is an adaptation principle in the world about us, few would deny. Does this evidence of purpose, of adaptation, of design not presume the existence of a Designer? Yes, answers the devout Christian. This argument had more authority before the days of the evolutionary hypothesis than it does today. Emergent or creative evolution, however, is less deterministic by far than original Darwinism. We may still maintain, from the evidence at hand that there is design in the universe. We cannot on this basis affirm that the Designer is the God we worship. Some blind force may be this designer. We must look further.

And so we turn to ourselves for proof that our God is. We know we are and we also find in our minds the idea of God. How did it get there? Its very presence in our minds we may maintain, argues the objective existence of God. This is an ancient argument. Many are inclined to dismiss it as utterly futile and to say that it is the outgrowth of wishful thinking. While it does not actually prove God's existence, it is a comfort and also

a suggestion of reality, and as such it may strengthen some.

Still with our minds focussed on ourselves, we find a further argument growing out of the moral and ethical nature of man. Where did we get this moral insight which sets man off from other creatures? Surely there must be a moral Being somewhere in the universe Who fashioned us after Himself. This argument may comfort us, may point the way, but it does not conclusively prove that the Christian God really exists.

The argument from history is not without value. Men have all along believed in God and that belief has influenced their history, we are told. The Hebrews believed that Jehovah or Jahweh prospered them when they did right and punished them when they violated His will. We can only say that history gives us comfort, not proof. It may be true that God is always on the side of those who have the strongest battalions.

Psychical research is coming forward in our day to prove the soul's survival after death and so, the existence of God. Sir Oliver Lodge and others like him will no doubt have our respect for their high purpose, but we cannot be sure they are right. Many of the evidences they have adduced have been shown to be forgeries. We can wish psychic research well, but we cannot accept its findings as proof—not yet. For some of us it is true that the more we know of spiritualists, the less we think of spiritualism.

Dr. J. G. Gilkey in a recent book "Getting Help From Religion," advances the argument of intellectual or logical necessity and illustrates it by referring to a jigsaw puzzle. When the puzzle was completed, it was discovered that a piece was lost and that it must have been a hand. Logical or intellectual necessity required

such a piece. So it is with God. He is necessary to explain the universe.

There is one other argument and it is distinctly personal. It is not proof. I refer to the mystical argument. It satisfies the person himself, but nearly always leaves doubt in the minds of others who may dismiss it as wishful thinking. But the man who has had a direct experience of God, the man to whom God has spoken, is convinced of the integrity of the witness he bears. Blessed is the man who has had such a personal acquaintance with God! We cannot depreciate this argument in our own case. In every generation, God has been directly apprehended by choice souls. They have become the inspired interpreters of His will to their fellows. They are the prophets of religion, the saints of daily living, the dynamic progressives of civilization.

Ways of Knowing God

While we may not be able objectively to prove the existence of God, the cumulative effect of these eight arguments is tremendous and makes it intellectually highly respectable to believe in Him. While we may not be able to prove our argument, those who doubt God's existence cannot prove their case either. We are, therefore, entirely right in positing God's existence as the best way of explaining the facts of life, and this reverent hearts have done in every age and in every land.

We may not by searching find out God nor see Him at any time, but we can experience His presence and live according to His ideals. There are many paths which may lead us to Him in the experience of our daily life. Albert W. Palmer in "Paths to the Presence

of God," Pilgrim, 1931 has learned five such paths—nature, science, humanity, worship, and Jesus. Arthur Bardwell Patten in "Can We Find God" knows sixteen such paths. The late venerable dean emeritus of the Vanderbilt School of Religion, Wilbur F. Tillett in "The Paths that Lead to God," distinguished seven ways to God's presence—nature, man's nature, Christ, the Bible, the Church, suffering and death, and reason.

Is it not true that every path leads to God or should lead to Him? There is no experience from which He can rightfully be excluded. He may be found in the cathedral of praise, but also in the washtub of drudging service. The beauty of the sunset and the majesty of the storm both attest His presence and His power. God is everywhere, interested in all our life. He is our inspiration, our comfort, our hope.

The Growth of the Idea of God

We can distinguish readily four stages in the growth of the idea of God among the Hebrews. When the scene opens, God is a God of vengeance. He becomes offended at men and punishes them arbitrarily. The next stage or phase of the Hebrew development of the God idea is the recognition of God as a Judge. He is fair. He does not punish arbitrarily, but deals with His people according to their deserts. Moses, the man associated with this view, has always been deeply venerated by the Hebrews as one of God's greatest prophets, and he is certainly so. He is indeed a great prophet whether we regard him as the originating seer or the adapting genius. When later on prosperity blessed the nation and distinctions of wealth appeared, some having more than they needed and others less, the far-seeing prophets understood their God not only

as just, but also as kind and merciful. God became to them the Great Benefactor, showing mercy to His people, forgiving them freely when they sought reconciliation with Him.

It remained for Jesus to give men the idea of God that grips the heart and energizes the will of mankind—that God is love. We find suggestions of this concept in the Old Testament as in Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, but Jesus revealed God as loving Father, working, suffering, sacrificing, rejoicing with His children. He also revealed Him as personal. We shall have more to say of this idea of God when we come to consider Jesus in the spiritual development of men. It is the acme of spiritual revelation. All that has followed since is but commentary.

And this also is to be noted—whenever the spiritual seers succeed in convincing their fellows that God is of a higher ethical character than they have been accustomed to think, a corresponding improvement occurs in the relations of men one with another. Men first got the idea that God is not a God of vengeance, but of justice. They then ceased to deal vengefully with their fellows and began to exact an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth only, not a life for a tooth. When they considered that God is kind and merciful, of course they too should exemplify these graces in their attitudes toward their fellows. Now that Christian men regard God as loving Father, they feel that they too must order their human relations in terms of love, of active good-will. The concept that men have of God is determinative of their attitudes toward their fellows, and this is exactly what we would expect. The greatest concept in the control of men's conduct is the conception they entertain with respect to God.

III

HOW SHALL WE UNDERSTAND JESUS?

What Think Ye of Christ?

Born in a manger, cradled in the trough from which the cattle ate, possessed of no property, rejected by the leaders of His people, crucified in his early thirties among malefactors, this man has become the dating point of all history. Why? What think ye of Christ? This question faced the Pharisees in the life time of Jesus and it faces us today. We cannot escape an answer. What do we think of this man who was done to death by those who feared the consequences of His teachings and yet who is more influential today than ever before? His influence continues to grow. And so the query He Himself directed to the Pharisees in His own day, What think ye of Christ, will not down. We must answer it too.

He was a man, He lived a normal human life. With alert, penetrating mind He thought on the ways of God with man. His development was standard, for He increased in wisdom (mentally) and in stature (physically) and in favor with God (spiritually) and man (socially). These are the four normal ways in which human beings develop. And yet He was so different from the ordinary men and women of His day that His contemporaries and those of the years nearest His earthly life had great difficulty in understanding him to be a man at all. The so-called Apostles' Creed has

nothing to say about His earthly experiences after affirming His birth until His crucifixion under Pilate. This is quite remarkable, in view of our insistence on His teachings and His life. Their interest in Him was religious, not biographical. The person of Jesus absorbed their thinking and taxed their ingenuity for exploration.

The Christ of experience is the Christ of certainty. It is today as it was with General Lew Wallace. He set out to read the scriptures to prove Christ an imposter. He was a professed atheist, but as he read with open mind he became convinced of his error. In Ben Hur he tries to give expression to his new found faith and to his confidence in the ultimate triumph of Christian truth. An honest man in his case gave an honest report. As a man, Jesus brought God into human life.

His Teaching and Example

Christ's direct apprehension of God, His constant fellowship with Him, His insistence that all men may enjoy these same privileges, are by many regarded as His most valuable contributions to the spiritual uplift of the race. However, though He preached, healed, and taught, He was primarily the teacher and His teachings are invaluable to us.

God, so Jesus taught, is a loving spiritual Father, deeply concerned for man, working constantly to promote his interests, grieved when man sins, rejoicing in his every evidence of spiritual progress, interested in every circumstance of his life. God cares for man—what power for uplift there is in that teaching! The Kingdom of God thus becomes the democracy of the loving family. God is merciful, tender, compassionate,

forgiving, love. What a difference this view makes in the outlook and the upreach of life! And this God loves every man equally—white, brown, black, red, yellow—every man; rich, poor, learned, ignorant, good, bad, high, low. We cling to such a God as this. We love Him. We worship Him.

And what of man? God loves him, agonizes for him, but is he of worth, does he deserve such consideration? We must postpone our detailed discussion of this question to a later time, but we may at this point affirm that Jesus represents all men as brothers and as sons of God. As such they are undoubtedly worthy to be loved and should prove themselves worthy in fact. The gospel of Jesus, we might well say includes the two ideas of the love of God and the dignity of man.

But we live in a realistic world in which idealistic conditions do not prevail. In our world, sin is a patent fact. Men may be worthy of God's love, but they are far from measuring up to its requirements. When men have sinned, is there any way of relief? Can their burden of sin be rolled away? Can the sinner have a new start? This issue also we will discuss later, but we cannot neglect to say here that Jesus taught the forgiveness of sin and complete reconciliation with God as fundamental concepts of the divine program. Life can never be the same again to those who comprehend the spiritual possibilities of this teaching. The sinner may be reconverted to God. He may be restored to God and to his own self-respect.

But what of the world—the universe of things and that organization of men which we know as the social order? We will discuss the involvements of this query later. However, we cannot understand Jesus without comprehending His view of the physical universe as

God's creation, and as furnishing an arena for the development of human beings for fellowship with God. He believed in the essential goodness of the human heart and in the salvability of man personally and in his social relations.

And what of the future? Is man a worm of the dust? Is he like the grass? Immortality will be the subject of a fuller treatment later. We may state here, however, that foundational in Jesus' teaching is the concept that man is an eternal being, that he will not pass away in the chemical change to which men give the name death. Man is essentially spirit. The body is its earthly dwelling place. We shall live forever, because we are the children of our Heavenly Father, so teaches Jesus.

These five teachings answer as many searching, compelling age-old questions of the human heart. Is there a God and of what kind? What is man? Is there another chance at moral renewal? How shall we look upon the universe of things and of men in their actual social relations? Does this life end all? Jesus' answer to these trenchant issues are the best men know. They satisfy the heart. They quicken the conscience.

But this would not be so, unless Jesus had in His own life exemplified these teachings. They were incarnated in His experiences. And so He not only was God manifest in the flesh, but He was man at his best. Who can conceive of a higher type of manhood than that which Jesus exemplified in His life? In the slightly more than thirty years of His living, he revealed God as love, men as brothers, how sinners may be reconciled, the innate goodness and friendliness of the universe and of the social order, and His confidence in the survival of man after death. In His example, we find our highest inspiration to live the spiritual life and to

Him as the exemplar of the good life we can with confidence resort.

The Meaning of His Cross

Humanly speaking, the crucifixion of Jesus is the most ignominious crime ever perpetuated upon a good man. It is the ignominious Cross undoubtedly, but the ignominy attaches to the perpetrators of the deed, not to the good man who was nailed there. Divinely speaking, the crucifixion is a never-forgettable dramatization of the love of God for man and the keenness of His suffering in the presence of their sins.

What we know as the atonement was achieved in the death of Jesus on the Cross. All Christians agree as to this fact, but the reasons assigned for the drama enacted on Calvary are many. We recognize the redemptive value of the Cross, but we do not agree in interpreting how this atonement was achieved nor why it was necessary in any event.

His death on the Cross was necessary. Of that we may be sure. Why did He go voluntarily to His death? In the Garden of Gethsemane He prayed for the passing of this cup of suffering. And yet He voluntarily allowed Himself to be arrested and crucified. He knew that His death on the Cross would do three things necessary to win free persons voluntarily from sin to the life of loving service to God and brothermen. First, His crucifixion would reveal the heinousness of sin. Men need to know this in order to be motivated to turn away from sin to righteousness. Secondly, men need to know the love of God, its compassionateness, its extent, its complete self-giving. Spiritual beings do not grow into God-likeness through fear of punishment,

but through voluntary self-surrender to love. Thirdly, men need to know the suffering their sins entail upon their loving Heavenly Father. Jesus believed that, could men understand that they crucify God anew every time they sin, that their sins break His great, loving, compassionate heart anew, they would have their own hearts broken, would repent, and would devote their energies to do His will on earth as it is done in Heaven. For these three reasons, He voluntarily went to the Cross, compelled it is true, but compelled morally.

Where Is Jesus Now?

It is the conviction of the Christian heart that Jesus lives and will continue to live with His Father and that His love for us will never grow less. We may not be able to explain all the seemingly conflicting accounts of the resurrection nor to agree on just what our Lord is doing now. But we are satisfied on one point—that He still lives, that He still loves, that His spiritual strength is available. We know by the record of human history that contact with Him makes pygmies into giants, transforms bad men into good ones, and out of the scum and refuse of humanity makes saints and prophets of the hopeful way. We know this, and our hearts rejoice. We know it, and we dedicate ourselves to Him.

IV

DO WE NEED THE HOLY SPIRIT IN OUR RELIGION?

This is Hallowe'en Night, when the spirits are abroad, so it is fitting, therefore, that we should to-night discuss the place of the Holy Spirit in the Christian program.

The Idea of the Holy Spirit

Though religion in its more primitive forms set great store by its doctrine of spirits, Christianity is the only modern world religion that definitely professes such a belief or finds place for the concept of Spirit in its ideology. In other religions God has become a sort of all-pervasive Force or a definitely definable sort of Being, serene and apart. The intimate fellowship of Christians with God warms their hearts through their realization that God is present with them and leading their lives and thoughts.

The monotheism of Judaism has no place for God the Son, nor for God the Holy Spirit. Jehovah or Jahweh is one and the exaltation of any other Person or being to the status of God is to their minds blasphemy. Mohammedans feel much the same way. Christians believe that the Holy Spirit became differentiated in a distinct personality at Pentecost.

Are we therefore to understand that the Holy Spirit had not been operative in human hearts prior to Pentecost? Some think so, but God is the same today, yester-

day, and forever. Surely then the Holy Spirit existed before Pentecost and had had relations with men prior to that glorious experience. We are rather to believe that the Holy Spirit had existed from the beginning, but that He had not been differentiated in thought or a distinct personality until Pentecost.

The Holy Spirit Today

Doctrines are of value only as they function in our life. Belief in the Holy Spirit may very conceivably have been of real value to first century Christians. Is it so for us in our day?

Jesus assigned two very definite functions to the Holy Spirit—comfort and the discovery of truth. But the comfort He had in mind was no palliative. He meant the comfort that comes from approving judgment on life. And so He says of the Comforter that “he when he is come, will reprove the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment (Jno. 16, 8)” —a stern sort of comfort, but the very type men need if there is to be progress in their spiritual discernment and practice.

But the Holy Spirit is also assigned the function of leading men into all truth. For the Christian there are no forbidden areas. All truth is of God, and the discovery of truth, no matter in what realm of experience, is thinking God’s thoughts after Him. Truth is progressive, advancing, and the Holy Spirit will lead men in its discovery.

When Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood, is it irreverent to say there was rejoicing in Heaven? When Pasteur discovered the principle of vaccination against certain diseases, again may we not

say there was rejoicing, just as there is over the one sinner that repents? When Copernicus and Galileo and Isaac Newton and Darwin and Millikan and Einstein introduced men into new conceptions of the physical universe, surely there was rejoicing in Heaven. It is no reflection on our religion, to find that it makes progress.

And yet we are so prone to want certainty that we regard spiritual truth as a fixity, rather than as a progression, and foolishly identify it with that view of the universe which prevailed in the first Christian century. Sad has been the warfare of science and religion, and so useless, if men had understood that security amid change is far better than certainty amid fixity, and that all truth is of God.

Progress and the Holy Spirit

Has there been progress in understanding Jesus' teachings since His day? Has the Holy Spirit led men to see the larger, deeper meanings and values involved in His views of God, of man, of sin, of the universe, and of the everlasting life? Undoubtedly. The improved moral and spiritual condition of mankind proves it conclusively. When Jesus came, women and children had no rights which their male superiors had to respect. He said nothing about Women's Rights or Children's Rights, but He taught the supreme worth of persons, and God's Holy Spirit has led us to see that this should mean equality of the sexes in domestic relations, in political, industrial, educational, recreational, and religious situations. A father may no longer refuse to bring up his child nor may he exploit him for financial gain. Parents owe certain duties to their off-

spring. The whole educational system is being made over in the interest of the development of childhood. We no longer think of education as indoctrination, but as the progressive discovery, in a shared situation, of the meanings, appreciations, and values of life, past and present, and their organization into programs of living. Education thus ceases to be a task and becomes a quest.

Jesus led no program of relief for the poor nor for improving the condition of prisoners. We are far from finality in dealing with these brethren of ours even in this day. But a glance at their hard and hopeless and helpless lot in His day heartens us greatly. In this twentieth century, the poor can no longer be sold into slavery nor be imprisoned for debt. Our prisons are today regarded as reformatories for restoring our brothers in bonds to themselves and to the social order against which they have transgressed.

Slavery was a recognized institution in Jesus' day. He nowhere denounces it. But he did a far more effective thing: He taught the dignity and worth of the individual man. God's Holy Spirit gradually and patiently brought Christian men to realize that slavery is unchristian, and so it is gone.

When Jesus came medical science was superstition and quackery. Today great hospitals apply through the ministering art of healing the discovered laws of God's ways with men's bodies. Skilled psychiatrists cast out demons from afflicted minds, only their terminology is different. They deal with complexes, rather than with demons. In no lands do we find scientific medicine indigenous except in the Christian lands. One of the finest services our Christian missionary enterprise is conferring on the non-Christian peoples, is the sending

to them of medical missionaries and nurses, and the installation of hospitals in their midst.

Jesus said nothing about political democracy, but the germ of His teaching as to human worth has gradually undermined the despotisms of the world. That all just powers are derived by governments from the consent of the people is a truism with us. Men in His day existed for their government. Now government exists to promote the interests of men. Larger year by year grows the recognition of governmental responsibility for the general welfare.

Scholarship, in the inductive sense, was unknown in Jesus' day. There were great thinkers it is true, but they did their thinking apart from actual life. Learning has flourished in the Christian lands, because God's Holy Spirit has through the centuries been leading men to discover truth.

Surely we have need today of the Holy Spirit, both as a comfort to us in our moral conduct and as the active leader in our discovery of the truth. We have need of these two functions of life, whether we label the agent achieving them for us the Holy Spirit or call it by some other name.

Knowing the Holy Spirit

How can we know that the aspirations that stir us to new endeavors are the work of the Holy Spirit and not the result of an upward surge within? How do we know, let us reply, that this upward surge is not itself the contribution to life of the Holy Spirit? Do we want to do the better, the higher thing because we are convinced that to do otherwise would be sinful? Are we convinced that doing the better things we aspire to

undertake will lead to righteousness of a higher order? Are we satisfied that the judgment we will pronounce on the consequences of the new thing we feel we should do because we esteem it to be higher, will be favorable to the preservation of personal values on a universal basis? Are we satisfied that the fruits of our new endeavor, will promote "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, and self-control" as they would not be promoted by any other procedure known to us? Affirmative answers to these queries will be evidence that the Holy Spirit is leading us.

We may not be able to explain psychologically how God's Holy Spirit speaks to men. Some have thought that the subconscious mind offers a satisfactory source of explanation. Others have insisted that this subconscious mind is a hangover from man's prehistoric animal ancestry and that far from offering a medium of communication between God and man, it actually inhibits such possibility of communication. Some deny that there is such a thing as the subconscious mind at all. No explanation that any man has at any time offered seems to satisfy all men, nor even all Christians. But that God should exist and that man should exist, and that there should be no way of communion between them, is preposterous. Christians are certain that God through the Holy Spirit has spoken and does speak to men's consciences, and so we have moral and spiritual progress. And so also we have the sacred scriptures of the great religious systems. And so, best of all, we have guidance for our life and a compelling sense of comfort when we have met life's issues and solved them in such a way as our consciences approve.

The Trinity and Monotheism

The doctrine of the Trinity has grown up out of the experience of men and women through the Christian centuries. Can we believe in the Trinity and remain monotheists? No, say the Jews and the Moham-medans. No, say the philosophers of many schools. Yes, affirms the heart of the evangelical Christian, based on his experience.

The doctrine of the Trinity has never given the author any trouble, since looking within he discovered that he is himself a trinity. He is will, intellect, and emotion. He has volitional, intellectual, and sensory or feeling powers. Yet he is not three persons, but one. There are clues in the scripture that this explanation is possibly correct. In the fourth gospel Jesus is described as the Word. But what is a word? It is the sign of an idea. It has to do with thought. It is concerned with intellect. We can begin here. God as the Son, in the trinitarian conception, corresponds to intellect, to thought, to mental power in man..

God as the Father is frequently associated with matters involving decision, both in the Old Testament and in the New. But matters involving decision are volitional acts. God the Father then, in the trinitarian conception, may be said to correspond to will, to volition, to the deciding power in man.

God as the Holy Spirit brings men to consider their conduct in terms of its consequences. He leads men to assume an attitude of approval, of appreciation, or the opposite, to life and its situations. But these attitudes are emotional attitudes and so we may say that the Holy Spirit, in the trinitarian conception, corresponds to the emotions in man,

What my emotional life is to me, leading me to react approvingly or disapprovingly to all lines of possible action, that the Holy Spirit is to the Trinity, performing for man the dual functions of comfort or its opposite and leading into all truth through affectionate embrace of investigative challenges. What my mental powers are to me, leading me to contemplate the great issues of life and to thread my thinking through their mazes, that the Son is to the Trinity, leading men to apply their mental processes to life and the universe and to their personal problems. What my volitional power is to me, enabling me to choose my own lines of action and so making me responsible for my conduct, that the Father is to the Trinity, leading men by His devoted love to choose always on increasingly higher planes the measures that appeal to their wills for decision.

V

HOW SHALL WE REGARD MAN?

What Is Man?

Is man a victim of cosmic forces beyond his control? Are his reactions predictable? Do his reflexes, his glands, the bonds growing out of his experiential stimuli and responses determine his choices? Is he a responsible person or a mechanism? Is he temporal or eternal? Is he a nervous system functioning through a body or a soul temporarily dwelling in a body? It is useless to sidestep these issues. They will not down.

On his physical side man is an organization of bone, flesh, and nerves. And when the chemical change called death occurs, the elements entering into man's body return to the earth whence they came, and after a comparatively brief space of time as the universe counts time, they become indistinguishable from inanimate nature. This may be called the natural history of man—birth, a brief space of activity, dissolution, return to the constituent chemical elements. Man is thus like the grass of the field. Today it flourishes. Tomorrow it is cast into the oven and burned. And man is no more. Is this so?

If so, life is a delusion. If so, the universe is crazy to preserve the inanimate substances through its law of the conservation of energy, and to permit its finest product, personal values, to be dissipated. If so, we are without hope in the world. If so, religious idealism is

an impertinence. If so, all the long hard struggle for human progress from the philosophy of the jungle to the philosophy of love as the basis of social relations, is a snare and a useless investment of energy. If man is just an animal, far better would it have been for him if he had been content to live as such.

Physically speaking, man is so insignificant that those who look only upon his body and compare it to the environing circumstances of his life may well entertain such depreciating ideas respecting him. He is a mere speck on the surface of a second or thirdrate planet. He abides on this planet for a very short period only. Then he sleeps with his fathers and the places that knew him, know him no more. When the telescope is trained upon the stellar universe, what magnificent distances it reveals and what magnitude in every way! With light moving 186,000 miles a second, stars exist whose light has been a million years in reaching us, and these stars are many of them so large that our own sun appears relatively insignificant. Astronomy, we are told, takes all the pride out of man. To which we may reply, "but man is the astronomer." He made the telescope. He records the astronomical behavior of the universe and photographs its facts. There would be no astronomy but for man.

Again the critic of man, refers us to the microscope, which reveals the marvels of infinitesimal smallness. Atoms are so small that we cannot even imagine their smallness. Even these we have broken up into electrons and protons, and it has been shown that energy is the ultimate basis of all matter. Here again we retort that man made the microscope and records the facts.

The biological scientists, too, have done their bit to discredit man. They trace his origin from the proto-

plasmic cell and chart his development through amoeba and fish and bird to the finished man. We are kin to the lower orders of creation, blood kin to them, we are told. They have even told us that our progress upward has been because of natural selection and the ability of the fittest to survive, and that there is no quality in the most upstanding man that did not potentially inhere in the original protoplasm.

Psychologically, and philosophically, and biologically viewed, man is the subject of his own illusions. When materialism appeared in philosophy, man lost his soul. When mechanism appeared, he lost his conscience. When behaviorism appeared, he lost his consciousness. Instrumentalism would deprive him of his belief in God or rather render such belief valueless by showing it to be a survival of superstition. "Give us all the facts," say the psychologists and philosophers, "give us all the facts and we will tell you in advance just what any man will do under any circumstances. No matter how free and responsible for his conduct any man may feel, it is vanity. We know better—he is a machine, victimized by cosmic forces beyond his control." Man they aver, is a sorry spectacle indeed. They permit him to be religious in that he may acknowledge the unrealized possibilities of the universe and aspire to achieve them, but for religion as such they grant him no need. The sooner we divest ourselves of the hampering restrictions of the world's living religions, the better it will be for us, they say. Not all psychologists and philosophers, however, are of this type. This view has no sense of historical perspective and juggles its facts in order to bolster up its case. A calm and judicious facing of all facts, cannot but confirm us we think, in our belief that God is and that man is a spiritual being. The

soul is coming back. Consciousness and conscience are already back.

Man's Freedom

Man is a person. That means he is a spiritual being, a soul. We are accustomed to say that man has a soul. We should reverse this, and say that man is a soul and has a body temporarily at his disposal. He is under obligation to make his body serve his eternal interests and not to allow it to enslave him. Is there evidence that the soul exists independent of the brain, the central nervous system? There are those who identify mind and soul, and make mind the function of the brain. Our view is that mind results as the soul organizes the brain to express its purposes in living. There is evidence to substantiate our view. There is evidence that the soul is able to use the brain as its medium of expression. Accidents sometimes happen in which a certain section of the brain, for example, the speech centre, is impaired. Is the presiding soul helpless in such a situation? Not so, in every case, for again and again the soul has been able to take over other unimpaired sections of the brain and make them serve its purpose. There are many instances on record where just this thing has taken place. One of the best discussions of this ability of the soul to use the nervous system as its medium of expression is found in Thomson's *Brain and Personality*. Another fine discussion of this matter may be found in Lashley's *Brain Mechanisms and Intelligence*.

On the natural side, this would point to man's freedom, though it is conceivable that a soul could have this ability and make use of it, and yet be circumscribed

by an envioning compulsion. There are two further arguments that greatly strengthen this view—the existence of moral sense and the personal experience of life.

There can be no reasonable denial that man does have a moral sense. His conscience lashes him or encourages him. When he does right, he is happy. When he does wrong, he is weak and impotent and unhappy.

Men have always acknowledged themselves as morally responsible for their conduct and their fellows have agreed. This is the argument from experience for the freedom of man. A certain type of criminologist however today would account for crime on the basis of social responsibility. Society does have responsibility with the individual man for the deeds of his life—a joint responsibility, but in the last analysis the individual is accountable in his own eyes and in those of his fellows. The very fact that we have ethical sense proves that man is free, for there can be no ethical sense in the absence of freedom.

How Religion Views Man

We have spoken quite critically of the depreciating view held of man by some psychologists, philosophers, and biologists. We have not spoken more critically of these scientists than the facts required. It remains to say that the religionists too have not always regarded man with high esteem.

The Buddhists and Hindus for example agree in regarding the highest iniquity in man to be his personality. Selflessness they teach is the goal of spiritual endeavor. The highest achievement of man is to be worthy of incorporation into the all soul. When this

state is reached, man sheds his personality as the reptile sloughs off his enveloping and restricting skin and becomes truly a spiritual being, so teach Buddhists and Hindus.

Mohammedanism, on the other hand, looks upon man as the play-thing, the puppet, the pawn of Allah. Man has no rights which Allah must respect. God deals with His creatures as He will, arbitrarily, exalting some and debasing others, nor do they have the right to protest. Their duty is obedience.

Christianity's View of Man

But Jesus teaches that we are children of our Heavenly Father and brothers one to another. We are under obligation to treat all men and women and children everywhere as our blood relations. We are endowed by God with moral freedom. We are co-workers with Him in making His plans and purposes known to all man and in building a better world. We are to work for the coming of His Kingdom, so that the will of God will be done in earth as in Heaven. We are capable of moral progress and also of moral lapse, but when we lapse our moral sense within leads us to repentance and when we progress, that same inner moral sense applauds our conduct. And we are capable of endless moral and spiritual progress. Nor does this life end the possibility of our growth and development. In the truly spiritual world, new opportunities for progress will constantly allure us. So teaches Christianity and in this teaching we take great satisfaction of heart.

VI

DOES MAN NEED SALVATION?

What Is Salvation?

Is it an event, or a process? Does it involve a change of nature or of purpose? Can man save himself or is divines assistance requisite?

Some well-intentioned persons in the past have said that man is totally depraved. Some persons today insist on the same. Naively we are told that all we need to do is to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and be baptized, and all will be well with us eternally. Is salvation as simple as this? How is it related to faith and to conversion?

What is faith? What is conversion?

"Faith," we are told, "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." This is very different from mere intellectual assent. And when the sacred writer tells the Phillippian jailer to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and that he and his household shall be saved, he has in mind not the intellectual assent to a certain body of historical fact, but the dynamic commitment of the self to a program that will make the hoped for things of the heart the solid realities of actual experience. Faith, in other words, is not superstition, it is not shutting your eyes to facts, it is not credulity, it is not believing what you know is not so. On its intellectual side, it is accepting the best hypothesis we can conceive of to make the spiritual re-

sources of the universe available. On its human side, it is the realization that we are morally and spiritually impotent and unable to heal ourselves. On its divine side, it is the calm conviction that God is able to give us strength and to qualify us to meet the emergencies of life. On its emotional and volitional sides, it is affectionate embrace of the most approved way of life. Paul had faith when he was not disobedient to the heavenly vision. The visionary plus the realist make the man of Christian faith.

Faith then involves God. It involves the conviction that God is able and willing to supply our inabilities. When we are injured physically, how are we healed? Not by ourselves. Skilled physicians may set my broken bone and apply antiseptics to prevent infection. They can cooperate with the restorative powers of my body in providing conditions conducive to healing. But they cannot heal. Healing must come from the body itself and the surrounding environment. Just so, when I am spiritually sick, because I am part and parcel of the spiritual universe, I can cooperate in supplying the conditions requisite for my spiritual restoration, but I cannot heal myself. I can repent for my sins, but my spiritual healing must come from God.

CONVERSION AND CHRISTIAN NURTURE

This makes it clear that the experience of salvation is a growing process. We need it constantly when we face the issues of our life and realize that we must venture upon paths untrodden before or when we look at our present path and realize it is not the best way to our goal. The beauty of this progressive view of the salvation experience consists in its constantly en-

larging program for life. There are many paths that we may take. Some are better than others. If we take any path other than the best, the divine grace is accessible to enable us to face about and go the best way.

"But," say some, "this is not salvation. It is Fatherly care. We cannot grow *into* grace, but only *in* grace after we have been saved." What is conversion anyway? Is it a change in nature or is it a redirection of the purposes of life? Are we really made in the image of God or is the impress of that image upon us due to a voluntary act of our wills? Are we actually God's offspring or do we make ourselves such? The conviction grows on men that they are God's children. We know that we are free moral beings and that we are responsible for our acts. As experience widens and new issues arise, we must choose our outcomes. Being free, we sometimes choose an outcome that appeals to us at the moment, but later we find that there is a better way. We commit ourselves to this better way. We turn about partially or wholly as the new insight requires in each instance. This is conversion. It does not necessitate a change in nature, though often we find ourselves loving the things we once hated and hating the things we formerly loved. Conversion is an act of the will. It is accordingly a full, voluntary, free decision to commit ourselves to a line of action in accordance with what our judgment indicates to be the will of God, and so it is a redirection of all our energies. Psychologically, this is explained as an integration of the life around a new purpose. It too is a growing process. It brings with it a sense of calm, of peace, of inner joy, and also of propulsive power.

Is nurture all that we need in the Christian life? There can be no doubt that many Christians today

have been brought up in Christian homes and have never thought of themselves as other than citizens of the Kingdom of God. They have erred it is true, they have sinned, but they erred or sinned as citizens, not as aliens. But there are persons whose home surroundings were not thus fitted to lead them by the process of nurture into a normal and natural spiritual awakening and commitment. And sad to say, there are some who have strayed even from Christian influences of the best into lives of dissipation and sin. Such persons need a violent type of conversion. There will for a long time to come and perhaps always be a need for this type of conversion.

Man and Suffering

Suffering has appalled men in every generation. Strong men continue to be broken in spirit by it, and some endeavor to escape by suicide. Saints are mystified by its presence. Why do men suffer, we ask. Various answers have been given: that it purifies; that it refines; that it has vicarious value; that it acquaints with God, because He suffers when His children do wrong; that love requires suffering when those we love fall below their best selves. Darwin said it is the cost of the evolutionary process. Malthus said it is the method by which the earth's surplus population is removed. Hegel said that suffering is "good in the making." It is the result of sin, say others. It is remedial say some, reformatory, expiatory. Still others regard it as a species of warning. All these points of view suggest that an explanation is yet to be found.

What did Jesus say about it? He suffered and surely knew its plan in spiritual development. He commanded

His disciples to love one another as He had loved them. The Christian therefore must live in a constant state of voluntary sacrificial self-giving. This prince of the spiritual realm went further even, for He pronounced a blessing on those who suffer. "Blessed are they that mourn," said He, "for they shall be comforted." But how shall they be comforted? By the removal of the causes of suffering.

In response to this beatitude, great hospitals have arisen for the healing of men's bodies and patient investigators search for the causes of disease and so for its eradication. Orphanages too have sprung up to give the under-privileged childhood of the race a comparable chance. Great reforms also in the home, in the school, in the state, in industry, in the uses of leisure, in the church have been instituted to remove the hampering causes infesting men's lives and preventing them from joyous self-expression in service. Jesus' doctrine of suffering thus becomes the dynamic of man's progress.

Should We Pray?

Since we are subject to natural law, is prayer unavailing? Were devout men of former days, who believed in the efficacy of prayer and practised it, deluded? Why did Jesus pray?

We are subject to natural law on our physical side, but we are more than our bodies. We have seen that man is a soul and that the body is its instrument, and so prayer is as natural as breathing and as necessary to spiritual vitality.

We do not necessarily assume that through prayer we will change the mind of God. At all times He wills

the very best for His children. Through prayer we come to understand God's plan for us and make His spiritual guidance available in our life. Prayer has many elements. Among them are praise, intercession, communion, meditation, petition for blessings and guidance, forgiveness, gratitude, all of which appear in the Lord's prayer or pervade it, and so it may be taken as a model for inclusiveness.

Does prayer change things? Does anything happen when we pray? A motto of the "Men and Religion Movement," was this—"You cannot do more than pray, till you have prayed." Another was, "We should pray as if it all depends upon God, and act as if it all depends on us." A third gripping motto said—"The resources of God are promised only to those who undertake the program of God." Prayer does change things. It may not produce rain, but it can change men, and it does. When we have prayed, we are different persons and have an added power.

By all means men need to pray and to pray without ceasing. This means we should always be ready to seek God's help in any time of need. It also means that we are not to limit our prayer life to times and seasons, places or methods. The prayer life is to be natural, free, flowing, growing. To programize it will be to deprive it of spontaneity. It must ever be the soul's sincere desire whether uttered or unexpressed.

Phases of Salvation

Salvation grows, progresses, advances, we have said. It has various phases. One phase of salvation may be called personal. Christian in Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" illustrates it.

A second phase is what we may call social. The individual has found a new joy. He wants to share it with his brothers and sisters. He becomes what we call a personal worker. The missionary spirit is innate in religion. A man who is socially minded does not care to be saved alone. He would rather go to hell with the rest of the folk than to be the only person saved.

A third phase may be called the societal. Men have organized certain institutions designed to serve their life, but as civilization advances and personal and social good multiply, it is discovered that these institutions have been left behind. This can only mean therefore that political organizations, that industry, that education, that the home, that whatever ministers to the leisure life of man, that the institutionalized church must all become Christianized. How the world stands in need of societal salvation!

When salvation truly fruits in a man's life, the lower orders of creatoin will know it. Herein is found a fourth phase of salvation. The saved man will treat his dog, his cat, his cow, his flowers, his trees, even the inanimate things round about him differently.

Salvation, we now thus summarize, is personal, social, societal, and functionally inclusive. The pagan, but tenderhearted poet Vergil, sensed this fact of experience when he spoke of the "tears of things," "*lachrymae rerum*." The saved man will preach the gospel in all the world and to the whole *creation*. Surely man stands in need of salvation, which brings him such everwidening moral insights and at the same time supports his morale in his efforts to achieve the good life.

VII

HOW WAS THE WORLD CREATED?

The Creative Act

I make a table and my friends say it is my creation. Perhaps it is but I made it out of materials already existent. I write the words of this lecture. Again my friends say it is my creation, but it is very largely the composite resultant of ideas already existent. If there should be ideas in it that have never been expressed before, we would say it is singularly creative. But it may be affirmed that it has not originated from that which had no prior existence.

When we use the word creation today with reference to the universe, we do not mean what is suggested in the opening chapter of our Bible—that the world has always existed, only its form has changed from chaos to cosmos. Creation to us must go behind the chaotic world to the Great First Cause. We mean by creation that something original happened. It is a deep and mystifying problem. We can only base our thinking therefore on the evidence we can discover and where evidence ends, make a hypothesis that appeals to us.

There are two such explanations of creation today. They are the mechanistic and the theistic views. There seems to be abundant evidence that unchanging consequents follow the same antecedent in our physical universe. This is a generalization, but so far it has worked. Indeed science is based on the assumptions

that our senses accurately report the facts of the physical world and that these facts are always the consequence of unfailing laws. We cannot prove either of these assumptions, but science must have a taking off place, and these hypotheses appear to scientists to be tenable. Given what we used to call matter and its ways, the scientist thinks he needs nothing further to account for the universe and all that in it is. The universe is so far as we can see, therefore a machine and needs no explanation.

The openmindedness of the scientist appeals to us. He is humble in the presence of a fact. He rejoices when any theory which seemed beforehand to be tenable is shown to be discredited. When some physicist discovers that the atom is not an ultimate constituent of matter, but is itself a product of electrons and protons, his fellow physicists do not issue anathemas of condemnation against the impiety of this man who has thus attacked scientific orthodoxy at its very origin. Rather they ardently welcome the suggestion and set out to see if this thing is so. Thus belief in the rotundity of the earth revolving around the sun has displaced the conception of a flat earth as the center of the solar system. Newton's law of gravitation, the principle of the conservation of energy, the quantum theory, the whole astronomical conception of the universe, the fundamental tenets of physics—all appear to need modification in view of Einstein's theory of relativity. No body of scientists has anathematized this brilliant Jew for having found what he believes to be the fundamental law of the universe. No matter what this relativity theory may do for scientific orthodoxy, if it appears to be a congruent generalization based on an accurate description of facts, it must be accepted and all

the books of science must be rewritten to conform to its cosmogony. The scientist knows there is no need to argue against a fact, and so he accepts facts and proceeds to adjust his thinking and theorizing to them.

The Scientific Evolutionist

Three things must be said relative to the scientific explanation of the universe. In the first place, it is exactly the same in its fundamental concept as the record in Genesis. It presumes the prior existence of matter. Its conception of the creative act or process, therefore, is the modification of existent materials through the evolutionary procedure. The scientist therefore, does not presume to answer our deepest question. Nor does the creation account in Genesis answer it.

In the second place, the scientific evolutionary process mechanically operative does not account for all the facts of life and experience. It does not account for purpose in the world. It does not account for God. In fact its whole tendency is to dispense with God. These are fatal failures.

And finally, in the third place, the scientist ceases to be a scientist and becomes a philosopher when he undertakes to interpret the religious and spiritual significance of his observations. It is the business of the prophet, not of the scientist, to speak to men of the spiritual significance of the findings of scholars respecting the universe and its laws. Few scientists have the prophetic insight.

The Theistic Evolutionist

The theistic interpreter of creation rests his case also upon two assumptions: first, that God created the

world as an original act and second, that all the laws which men may discover as operative in the universe are but God's way of doing things.

The theist is not troubled by a revolving world, nor by evolution, nor by electrons, nor by relativity. All these ideas are to him but God's methodology in creation. He also distinguishes between the body of man and the soul that inhabits it. He is not alarmed when the scientist tells him that the natural man developed by slow processes from the primordial protoplasmic cell. Nor is he troubled to explain the presence of purpose in the evolutionary process. His belief in God accounts for that fact. Progress is more than a fact to him. It is ascribable to the divine volition, for God is to him the original progressive. Evolution is therefore God's method of creation—that and nothing more.

His theistic view also accounts for the spiritual nature of man, which is outside the evolutionary process. Just as God created the universe by an original act, so He made man in His own image. When God had made man in His own image, man's spiritual nature became transmittable through the germplasm just as his physical frame was so transmittable. The theistic evolutionist thus accounts for man's freedom and his moral aspiration by his hypothesis. He feels that his view accounts for all the facts of the universe, including man and the imponderables.

Religion and Progress

The theistic view of the creation has one exceedingly valuable suggestion to make to the religionist—that our religious conceptions should advance with widening

experience and deepening insight. Religion needs to accept the idea of progress and to adjust its attitudes toward new discoveries accordingly.

Religion has been greatly hampered by the authoritarian view. Progressive religion is released from this spiritual bondage. It is an adventure with God in spiritual discovery.

Belief in the fixity of things and ideas is all the more inexplicable when we come to fixed notions of the universe. Why should religious men identify their religion with any particular world view? Why did the Church oppose the idea of a round earth revolving around the sun? Why should Darwin be execrated and denounced as an atheist because he had discovered as he thought the principle of evolution in the physical world? The warfare of religion on science is one of the saddest chapters in the record of civilization. The heresy trials of the church are a disgrace to its intelligence; far more, they are a blot on its fundamental concept. In an advancing world, the religious man has God. To this concept he is anchored. All else is fleeting, and is not this all he needs?

The Christian View of the World

The world means two things to the Christian—the world of things and the world of men. We have already treated the latter concept in our discussion of salvation which we found to be more than personal. The real gospel is also societal and inclusive of the total realm of experience. Jesus came not to condemn the world of men in their organized and institutionalized relations, but to save the world. John 3:16-17 makes this perfectly clear. Here the personal and so-

cial gospel, the complete gospel, is epitomized as nowhere else in the sacred writing.

But what shall the Christian think of the world of things? How did it become to be? Did God create it in six days of twenty-four hours each? That is what the opening chapters of Genesis affirm. There is no convincing evidence to show that the word "day" in this biblical account of the creation signifies other than its ordinary connotation. Any attempt to make it mean an unlimited period of time rests upon a mistaken notion of God's revelation to men. We have seen that He does reveal Himself, but that men can understand Him only according to the standards, insights, and outlooks of their own day. It is remarkable how the writer of the creation story in Genesis, without the scientific method had such clear insight into the stages of creation. That there are contradictions in the two accounts given us there and certain items which patient investigation since the publication of Darwin's "Descent of Man" has shown untenable, in no way invalidates the religious significance of the accounts we have. The story is theo-centric. It derives from God. "In the beginning God"—that is the way our Bible begins and there we take our stand. The religious significance of the Genesis account is an undeniable tonic to the soul.

But we are not bound by the cosmological ideas of the Genesis writer nor are we to be prevented by them from accepting later discoveries illustrating the truth that God made the world and that without Him was not anything made that was made. In other words, we do not go to our Bible for our science, but to nature. We go to the Bible for ethical insight and moral aspiration, for the record of God's dealings with man, to discover how deeply religious men in another land and

generation experienced the love of God, and we come away satisfied, satisfied even though we find evidences of progress in men's understanding of ethical conduct, of moral behavior, of God Himself. But we do not feel obligated to accept the conception of the universe which was prevalent in that prescientific day, any more than we accept the despotic forms of government under which they lived and in spite of which they found God. The Bible is to us therefore the great storehouse of religious insight. It is not a book of science nor a treatise on government. Failure to see this has reddened the pages of history with the blood of the saints.

Evolution and the Future

We have said that man's spiritual nature is outside the evolutionary process. That is true only as to its origin and in order to distinguish man the soul from the body his habitat. For after the creative act by which God breathed into man, the body, the breath of life in which he became a living soul, his whole history has been characterized by progress. Will the evolutionary, the progressive, the developmental process ever cease?

Christians are convinced that in Jesus we have the perfect revelation of God and that in Him spiritual perfection was attained. It is true that we get constantly enlarging conceptions of His nature, of His teachings, of His purposes, but this is due to our inability in any moment of time completely to understand. It is not strange that every new plan or method or concept of teaching finds its initial practice in Him. He was the perfect teacher and made men's life-experiences the basis of His curriculum. We hail this as a

thoroughly modern idea and so it is, but Jesus practised it in His day. All our new discoveries in ethical principle, in moral concept, in spiritual excellence are but inferential interpretation of Him and His teaching. He does not change, but our conceptions of Him vary with the processes of the sun.

We know that in the practice of our understanding of the spiritual verities we have a long road ahead of us. For us progress and life cannot be separated, and evolution is but another name for the achievement of the more abundant life. Our idea of God the loving Father, of Jesus as His perfect revelation, of the Holy Spirit as His daily interpreter, and of progressive advancement in spiritual concept and endeavor as the experiential goal, satisfies the profound and elemental longings of our hearts, and so to us life becomes the adventurous discovery, in shared situations, of new meanings, more uplifting appreciations, and fresher and deeper values, which we must organize into effective programs for the progressive realization of God's evolving program in the world.

VIII

DO WE NEED THE CHURCH?

The Nature of the Church

The Church is not responsible we wish at first to say, for the "mess we are in." Nor is it the business of the church to initiate or sponsor specific measures of reform. The present situation is the resultant of economic, industrial, political and other forces outside the control of the Church. The Church should motivate men to live the good life in whatsoever condition they may chance to find themselves, and should leave to their quickened consciences the matter of reformative programs. This is good Americanism and it is also good Christianity. The Church is a political force, but let us not make it a political party.

Just as we have priests and prophets in the field of religious leadership, just so do we have two views of the Church—the sacramentarian and the voluntary, the imperialistic and the democratic, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant, with all the gradations in between.

To the devout Catholic the Church is the channel of the divine grace. There is no salvation aside from the Church. From this fundamental tenet follow the hierarchy with its pope, its cardinals, its bishops, its priests, all imparting the divine blessing to whomsoever they will and withholding where it pleases; and from this fundamental tenet also flow the confessional,

penance, worship, the sacraments of the Church, etc. There is consistency at least in the Catholic viewpoint and those who believe in the kind of spiritual set-up which their concept of the religious life presupposes, find no little comfort in the Church.

The Protestant, however, insists on his freedom of approach directly to God. He does not need to go to the Most High by way of the minister or the altar. He is himself a king and a priest unto God. (Rev. 5, 10). He therefore goes to Church or not as he elects, and usually he elects to go only if the Church program suits him. The Church is to him not a channel of divine grace, but a voluntary group of persons associating themselves together because of their allegiance to Jesus.

In any case both Catholic and Protestant agree in one particular, that it is the indwelling spirit of Jesus that constitutes the Church. The Catholic thinks that spirit is procured for the local groups of the Church and for the Church universal through the mediation of the hierarchy. The Protestant however believes that the free individual is filled by the spirit of the Christ and that he thereupon seeks out other persons who have experienced a similar in-filling and together they organize the Church as their voluntary act. Both Catholics and Protestants acknowledge their allegiance to and dependence upon Christ, but they have widely divergent methods of expressing the fact. It is most encouraging however to find agreement between these two groups on a matter so vital.

The Function of the Church

Different views as to the function of the Church are regnant today. An ancient confessional of the Church

admonished us that the chief end of man is, to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever. Is this the function of the Church? Certainly, if it is not narrowly interpreted and if it is not based on a depreciative conception of human worth and integrity. We cannot know God without knowing His children and we cannot enjoy Him at all except as we bring joy to those children. That is the function of the Church—to make the purpose of God effective in the world, in terms of the revelation of God in Jesus and as interpreted progressively by the Holy Spirit.

Church and State

The Church is in a difficult situation in all parts of the world in our day. In democratic America, honorable persons are being refused citizenship because they will not place their consciences in the keeping of Congress, while Christian young men in State institutions of higher learning are being forced in violation of their consciences to join the R. O. T. C. The Greek Orthodox Church has been routed in Russia. Mussolini has asserted the control of the Fascist state over the youth of Catholic Italy, the priests of the Catholic Church are being banished from Mexico, and Protestantism is being "totalitarianized" in Germany by Hitlerism. The Church must resist these encroachments, or lose its soul. But there must be separation of Church and state.

How is the Church Related to Industry?

Just at this present time because of our economic stress, leaders in our churches are insisting that the

Church is to blame by neglect at least for the situation in which we find ourselves and that therefore the Church should do something about it. Every general church gathering held within the last few years has issued a pronouncement on our industrial system. One of them at least has created a "Council for Social Action." They naively assume that the profit motive is unChristian and the capitalistic system is demonic. They would abolish both the profit motive and the capitalistic system, and would set up a kind of socialistic state. That there are abuses in the pursuit of profit as a motivating principle for business enterprise, there can be no mistaking. Likewise there are abuses in the procedures of not a few capitalists and captains of industry. The Soviet government in Russia has proceeded on the basis that a new economic order will cure all our social ills. Those who agree with them should go to Russia and help them in their program. It does not appear at this distance to be working with 100% perfection. A good demonstration there would be of inestimable value to the world.

The Church and the Kingdom of God

The Church has a definite responsibility for the Kingdom of God. While this Kingdom is within the individual Christian, it must inevitably express itself in social relationships. We are to pray that this Kingdom may come in earth as in heaven. The doing of God's will insures the Kingdom's establishment. The Jews of Jesus' day had suffered so terribly at the hands of their oppressors that they could only retain their faith in God by believing that He would suddenly establish His rule in the earth and exalt them to the

place of leadership in that Kingdom. This is known as the apocalyptic view of the Kingdom's coming. These oppressed and suffering Jews looked for a worldly Messiah, who would avenge their injuries, redress their wrong, and exalt them among the nations. The situation in modern Germany may lead to a similar doctrine in our day.

When Jesus came many Jewish leaders were disappointed. He had no patience with force. Vengeance was entirely foreign to His nature. He prayed for His enemies and for those who despitefully used Him, even for those who took away His life on the Cross. And what was more disappointing, He taught His disciples to do the same thing and to resist not evil, but to love it to shame and repentance.

A strange interpretation of this whole situation is that offered by no less a Christian leader than the great medical missionary, Albert Schweitzer.* He argues that Jesus Himself taught His disciples to expect His sudden return, because He too was committed to the apocalyptic program of the Kingdom. Proceeding from this fundamental conception, all Jesus' teachings take on value only for a brief period between the ascension and the expected return in power. He calls them "ethics for the time in between." He does not think that Jesus' teachings therefore apply to the realistic world in which we find ourselves and if He had really known that His apocalyptic views were a delusion, He would never have delivered the sermon on the mount, nor taught non-resistance, nor advocated love among men as the great dynamic life-principle, nor prayed for His enemies, nor voluntarily have gone to His death.

**The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Macmillan, 1910.

And yet this strange theology has sent Dr. Schweitzer out into darkest Africa to practice the healing art because he endorses Jesus' spirit of devotion to what He conceived to be right. We cannot but admire a man who so nobly devotes himself to human service. We reject his theology and what is popularly known as his "debunking" of the Galilean. We approve and applaud his Christian life.

There are those however who still adhere to the apocalyptic coming of the Kingdom. Like the early Christians they rationalize the expectation by saying that God and man do not compute time alike—that a thousand years in His sight are but as yesterday when it is past. In this matter Einstein's relativity may help them. They expect the world continually to grow worse—they assert it has grown worse, despite all the evidences of progress that surround us—until God shall not be able longer to endure its iniquity, and will destroy it except for the elect, who will be caught up unto heaven, etc., according to the premillenarian program.

This view of the Kingdom's coming really belittles God. It means that God will be defeated in His world, that love is not the compelling power Jesus believed, that man is as a race incapable of spiritual achievement and so deserves destruction. Those who get comfort out of this pessimistic view are entitled to it. But the promise of scripture is clear that every knee eventually will bow and every tongue confess. The great commission to preach the gospel to the whole creation holds, and "faith, hope, and love" abide. God will not be defeated in His world. Men are free—He made them so—but they are also capable of love and prone to choose its pathway.

The Kingdom will come by slow processes, we believe. Progressive realization is its chief outward characteristic, just as love is its inner motive principle. The kings and priests of the Most High will devote themselves willingly, wholeheartedly to its advancement. Its spiritual leaven will silently, gradually, assuredly permeate the whole lump of human life—home, state, school, leisure, industry, church—and transform it into the commonwealth of God. Charged with peculiar responsibility in this progressive reconstruction of life and the social order stands the Church, the voluntary organization of Christ-minded men dedicated to the effective realization of His spirit in all experience. It is a challenging task. How shall we go about it?

The Program of the Church

Christian leaders are beginning to see that the Church is essentially and vitally an educational institution. They call this educational work, religious education. They are agreed also that the Church should aim in its program of religious education to provide for worship, for fellowship, for counseling, for activities, for the progressive understanding of the divine purpose through the learning-teaching situation. These provisions should spread themselves out into all the relations of life—domestic, political, educational, leisure, industrial, religious. There is no domain or realm of life in which the Church does not have a stake.

The Church and Sectarianism

Jesus was no schismatic. He attended the synagogue services and made pilgrimages to the temple at Jeru-

salem. He prayed for the oneness of His followers and gave as the reason for it—that the world might believe that God had sent Him (John 17, 21). We give ourselves to missions at home and abroad, to evangelism, to benevolent enterprises, to religious education, to social service, to publications, and in so doing we do well, but we do not do the best. We are dealing with peripheral matters when we expend our energies in these causes. The central condition of success for the program of Jesus in the world is the oneness of His followers.

No less a leader than John R. Mott, world citizen of the Kingdom, says that “a lost world is the price we pay for a divided Christendom.” The Church is impotent in so many directions because of its denominational spirit. We cannot bring our united Christian conscience against war to bear on the governments of the world, because of our divided condition. Denominational disarmament must precede international disarmament. What can the two hundred and more competing, sectarian, denominational groups of Christians do against the united will of strong nations determined selfishly to pursue their national interests at the point of the sword? We abdicate our right to speak for the sanctity of persons in our present enfeebled condition. And the nations will continue to make our sons cannon fodder and gas victims until we answer the prayer of Jesus for the oneness of His followers.

Even the missionary program of the Church is terribly handicapped by the sectarian spirit. No part of the Laymen's Report on Missions has received severer criticism, than its recommendation that the denominations should raise money for missions to be administered by a central board. (The Near East College

Association has been doing this for many years for the colleges of that area.) We are told that this simply will not work. Of course it will not work, if the denominational spirit is to dominate and control men's giving and the expenditure of the funds they give. The end of denominationalism, at least of sectarianism, seems to be the price we must pay for a Christianized world. The Church cannot accomplish its work of moral and spiritual leadership, divided as it is. That program must suffer defeat, or denominational sectarianism must go. Are we willing to pay the price of an inclusive church—a church that is animated by the love of God and for the sake of Christ will welcome to its fellowship persons of all shades of theological belief, requiring only that they shall accept Christianity as a way of life and dedicate themselves to walking in its path as they shall discern it? This is the price we must pay in toleration, in mutual respect, in genuine appreciation of variant views, if we are to answer Christ's prayer and make His Church victorious in all the realms of human experience. Let us rejoice that two world Conferences have been held to discover a way or ways of effecting Christian union—the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work (1925), and the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order (1927) and that this summer both these groups are to hold second conferences in the British Isles. Let us rejoice likewise that Congregationalists, Methodists, and Presbyterians in Canada, that Christians and Congregationalists, that Unitarians and Universalists in the United States, that Evangelical and the Reformed Churches in the United States, that Presbyterians in Scotland, and the Methodists in England have already united. We were a long time getting this way. It may take us a long

time to get out of it. But eventually we will. Jesus prayed that we might, and His prayer will be answered. He is "the Way."*

Do we need the Church? To ask is to answer. Of course we need the Church. We need it because it is the institution designed to exalt Jesus in the world.

*This is the essence of the E. Stanley Jones' recommendation that we should have a United Church in America with denominational branches. It is certainly encouraging that no less a consecrated layman than John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in a broadcast on February 17, 1937, has endorsed this view. This too is the essence of the Laymen's Appraisal of Missions, as set forth in the volume entitled, "Re-Thinking Missions."

IX

OF WHAT VALUE IS THE BIBLE?

Tomorrow is Bible Sunday. It is fitting therefore that we should consider the value of this unique book in our broadcast tonight.

The Influence of the Bible

The Bible continues to be our best seller. Each year the presses in the Christian nations turn out millions of copies. The public purchases them. Men do not spend money for that which satisfies not. It is no exaggeration to say that our Bible is the most influential book of history. Our American Bible Society, organized in 1816, has published no less than 237,000,000 copies of the gospels, testaments, and complete Bibles. It circulates the scriptures annually in more than one hundred and seventy-five languages and dialects, and employs in the work of distribution in the non-Christian lands nearly four thousand agents. The British Bible Society has an equally successful record, while the several denominations have not failed in their duty or privilege along this line. Men go to the Bible for insight, for inspiration, for comfort, for guiding life-principles, and their heart hunger is satisfied. Our Christian scriptures tell us how men have faced every type of human experience and were yet able to hold fast to their confidence in God. Manifestly such a book

has a unique value and has exerted and will continue to exert a wide influence.

Is the Bible God's Work?

We have such reverence for our Bible that to us it has become God's word. But it is not God's only word. God has not yet ceased to speak to men nor will He ever cease. The Bible means more to us than it did to our fathers and grandfathers. It will mean more to our descendants that it does to us, and in this we should rejoice. Wisdom will not perish with us nor will fresh insights into God's program cease. We will always have need of the priestly function in religion, by which we mean the function of initiating men into the religious experiences of the past, rich in witnessing, ritual, and encouragement for living. But there will always be the correlative need of the prophetic function, by which we mean leading men into new concepts, fresh meanings, more affectionate appreciations, a keener and more penetrating sense of values. And so we will revere the Bible of our Fathers, but at the same time we will appreciate the spirit of the songwriter who speaks of "The Bible According to you."

This dignifies man. It brings the Bible into the service of life and challenges man to make it the efficient ally of his spirit. Any man who can see a deeper spiritual meaning in the Bible than men have seen before, who can discover from its reading and study a more helpful principle for the guidance of life—is a benefactor of his kind and prophet of God. Horace Bushnell was such a man, with his insistency on the spirituality of life. Phillips Brooks was such a man, with his clarion annunciation that God cares for every man. Wesley

was such a man, with his insistence on the life wholly surrendered to God. Knox was such a man, with his proclamation of the independence of the church from the domination of the civil state. Paul was such a man, with his doctrine of the liberal spirit questing for God and as not bound by the shackles of the law which had served as a school-master, but must not control the whole of man's life. Jesus did not hesitate to set aside the scriptures. "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time—but I say unto you." This was His attitude and it incensed the ecclesiastics of His day. He believed in the Bible, quoting it on the Cross and urging men to search it as revealing Himself, but He did not propose to bind men's lives by any literal interpretation of it. Jesus evidently believed that the Holy Bible was made for man, not man for the scriptures, and that the Bible according to the individual, earnest Christian is the living Bible.

Is the Bible God's word? Undoubtedly. The men whose experiences of God it records were conscious of their direct apprehension of the Divine. To them, in terms of their experience and in the light of their world-view, the Bible was God's word. And it has been God's word to succeeding generations, in so far as its message spoke to their hearts and energized their wills. In this vitally real sense, it is God's word to us today and will continue to be to men and women yet to live. And it is God's word in a deeper sense too—in that it contains the revelation of Jesus—God's Real Word to a groping world.

Revelation and Inspiration

Is the Bible inspired? Is it a work of divine revelation? Yes. Revelation is God endeavoring to make

Himself known to man, while inspiration is man's ability to respond to the divine revelation. There is nothing mysterious about these doctrines. They are facts in human experience. The belief in God and in man as His spiritual creature necessitates that God should endeavor to express Himself to His offspring. Revelation is therefore normal, natural, inevitable. But this also requires that man should be able to understand God and become his interpreter. Thus inspiration too is normal, natural, inevitable. But it is just as normal, just as natural, just as inevitable that one man should exceed another or at least differ from him in the ability to understand and interpret the divine revelation. Races too differ in this ability. That is why we have the several sacred writings, among which we rate those of the Hebrews highest.

It would perhaps be better to say therefore that the men of the Bible were inspired and that their record is to us a constant source of inspiration. God spoke to them and they interpreted as they understood. We exercise our judgment as to whether their inspiration was genuine or as to its degree, in the importance we attach to their record in living our lives unto God. This view of the Bible, which Paul specifically expressed and Jesus clearly implied through His practice, makes it possible for Christians to believe in the progressive revelation of God's plans and purposes, as men's experiences enlarge. It also obviates the defensive, apologetic attitude which so many devout Christians have felt constrained to adopt with reference to the Bible. What if there are verbal inaccuracies, and even contradictions, in our Scriptures? It is but natural that these should occur when we consider the methods of transmission and of translation, and

particularly when we consider that so many different persons were endeavoring in times far separated to give their understandings of the spiritual values of life. This view provides for errors, for misunderstandings, for contradictions, for growth, for the discovery of the truth which ministers to the life of service.

The Unity of the Bible

We say that our Bible is a unity. This is true in the sense that in every book of the sixty-six we can recognize the spirit of God endeavoring to make His will and mind and purpose known, but not in the sense that it is all on the same plane of moral and spiritual excellence. There is but one twenty-third Psalm, but one sermon on the Mount, but one thirteenth of First Corinthians. There is but one parable of the Good Samaritan, but one parable of the Prodigal Son, but one twenty-fifth of Matthew, nor does the rest of the Bible reflect the high ethical and spiritual quality of these golden passages. Indeed the whole underlying philosophy of the Old Testament is different from that of the New. The Old Testament is based on the view that righteousness pays dividends in worldly prosperity. But the New Testament represents righteousness as its own reward and provides for the sacrifice of life itself in the effort to promote it. And yet throughout the entire record of both testaments, it is the same divine Being speaking to men and anxious to communicate to them constantly growing conceptions of His own loving devotion and of the moral order of the universe.

The Authority of the Bible

In what, then, does the authority of the Bible consist and of what use is it to modern men? Do we need a new Bible—a synthetic collection, for example, of the best religious teachings of all the world's relations?

The Bible does have authority in men's life,—in my life, in your life. But this authority is not superimposed. The Bible is our help, our aid, our assistant in spiritual living—not a record that binds the spirit. There is no authority that can bind the spirit of men. God has made him free. But when in searching the scriptures we find principles for life's spiritual guidance which we understand to be, and identify with, the will of God for man, we know that the Bible has authority. We are, therefore, obligated as sincere seekers after God's will to know the Bible. We are not free to ignore so potent a source of spiritual insight.

We do not need any additions to our Bible nor any synthesis of the several sacred writings—not that the Bible as at present constituted gives all the spiritual insight that men may need, but that the Holy Spirit will interpret the record we have in ever-enlarging appreciations, meanings, and values, so that the Bible is sufficient for our spiritual nurture. Of course if we do not believe that God is in intimate and constant communication with His children in the mystical experiences of men, if we believe that He has no further message for us, then perhaps like Mr. Wells we might set out on a quest deliberately to make a written record that should represent our loftiest aspirations. But in view of the spiritual illumination and enlargement of man through communion with God, the futility of such procedure seems evident.

How Did the Bible Assume its Present Form?

This brings us to the two questions, How did the Bible originate? and How did it get its present form? Our theory of revelation and of inspiration has already made it clear that a multiplicity of materials would arise among any people for spiritual edification and enlightenment. It remains to be said that certain pragmatic tests (II Tim. 3, 16) had to be applied to these documents to determine their spiritual value and that Luke's (Lk. 1:1-4) method of patient research was used to improve them.

Naturally men would differ as to what documents should be preserved and as to whether the documents finally decided upon needed any touching up in the view of God's later messages to them or the prevailing world view of their age. In case of two or three documents covering the same or similar ground, it would be decided whether they ought to be combined into one. Finally, some documents would be accepted in one part of the Church, and others in another. We find everyone of these procedures obtaining in the formation of the canon of our Scriptures. Does this detract from their value? Not at all, because God evidently revealed Himself to the collectors, the redactors, the revisionists and responding through inspiration, they gave us our Bible, which carries within itself the evidence that its authors and finishers were inspired.

When we come to the consideration of the form in which the books of the Bible now exist, there is internal evidence that even the Old Testament law preserved in the Pentateuch is derived from four separate sources. Biblical scholars call these the J document be-

cause the word used for God is Jahweh (originated in Judah), the E document because the word for God is Elohim (originated in Ephraim), the D document because it originated during the so-called deuteronomic reform which could not have antedated 722 B. C., and the P document which is attributed to the prophet Ezekiel and his contemporaries in exile (572 B. C.) and is known as the Priestly Holiness Code. The earliest document in the Old Testament canon is of Canaanitish origin and is contained in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. The latest book is the book of Daniel. Some think the prophets antedated the law. These and other discoveries of scholars should not disturb our faith in the least nor in any way detract from the value of the Old Testament for us.

We find a parallel situation in the New Testament. There is internal evidence that Mark, the earliest gospel for example, is itself the result of the fusion of prior accounts of the incomparable life, perhaps four. The manuscripts reveal also that certain passages have been touched up, or that glosses have been added as the scholars say, to make clear that the understanding of the passage prevalent in the copyist's day is not to be escaped in the reading, among which are the conclusion of John's gospel and the reference to baptism as burial of sin. Certain books that are now in the New Testament had hard sledding to be included, among them are Hebrews, Jude, II Peter, II and III John, the Revelation, and James (Martin Luther ardently challenged the authenticity of this book because it made his doctrine of justification by faith difficult to some). Certain books were finally excluded though honestly contended for in certain sections of the church, among them are First Clement, Shepherd of Hermas, The

Epistle of Barnabas, the Gospel of the Birth of Mary, the Gospel of Nicodemus, and others.

How Shall We Use the Bible?

We must not use it as a book of science, or history, or psychology, but as a witness to the eternal verities of the ethical and spiritual life. We must not use it to bolster up our theological and sectarian narrowness nor as a fetish. It is said that you can prove anything by the Bible. There are various methods of studying it—devotionally, topically, historically, as literature, for inner light, for personal guidance. It is well to employ various methods of study at different times and for different purposes. But by all means study it, make it your very own, know where to go to its illuminating pages for help, accustom yourself to finding in it principles for meeting the problems and issues of daily experience. No Christian ever lost any time that was given to the study of the Scriptures, for it is not a restriction on life that comes from the perusal of our Christian Bible, but the redirection of life into ever widening paths of abundant living that eventuates. The source material for life, outranking all other, is our Bible. This is the verdict of the modern religious educator, who aspires to bring growing persons to understand the problems and issues of life and to programize their conduct in terms of the highest principles of living. For the Christian religious educator these principles are nowhere so well illustrated as in the Bible. The Bible is the finest source book we have for religious education, whether of the child, of the youth, or of the adult.

X

IS CHRISTIANITY THE FINAL RELIGION?

The Basis of a Final Religion

Man's nature is the basis for a final religion. Long ago Paul sensed that all men are blood kin, and that racial differences are the result of environmental conditions and historic changes. The elemental needs of men are identical. On the animal side, this is readily evident—food, shelter, raiment. Man cannot long exist where these necessities are not met.

But his spiritual needs are equally evident to the discerning mind. Man does not live by bread alone. Prayer and communion with God are as necessary for his spirit as sunshine for his body. He aspires to know the truth, to understand things in their relations to personal values and to understand these values in their relation to God and brotherman. Experimentation in the discovery of this truth has been necessary, and so we have the several religious systems. The world's religions are but experiments in the effort to understand God. When these experiments or systems are compared with each other and the ultimate truth of the universe is discovered, they will all have converged into one. Even before that great consummation, one technique, one religious system ought to be found with the best conceivable method of arriving at that goal. Is Christianity that method? Does it have the necessary technique for arriving at ultimate truth? Does it meet the conditions of a final religion?

Basic Values of the World's Living Ethical Religions

There have been many religions in the record of human effort to find and understand God and to relate men to Him. Most of them have served their day and been superseded by some other that commended itself as more promising. We may be sure, however, that a religion which has survived the test of real value to persons in their search for God and the truth, has some permanent, basic, abiding conception underlying and animating it. We have eleven such living major organized religions in our present-day world. Prof. R. E. Hume has made a careful study of their basic conceptions of the world's living religions, besides paganism which is not ethical. Following him we catalogue the distinctive teachings of these ethical religious systems below. They are listed in the chronological order of their founding, and in each case the approximate number of adherents is given.

Basic Teachings of the Living Ethical Religions

Religion	Date of Beginning	Number of Adherents	Distinctive Teaching
Hinduism	1500 B. C.	217,000,000	Immanence of the divine in the universe.
Judaism	1200 B. C.	11,000,000	Salvation through obedience to the righteous God.
Shintoism	(?) 660 B. C.	16,000,000	Nature a beautiful divine creation.
Zoroastrianism	660 B. C.	100,000	Man in his struggle with evil may have the active cooperation of the cosmic goodness.
Taoism	604 B. C.	43,000,000	The religion of the divine way.
Jainism	599 B. C.	1,000,000	Self-renunciation, the method of salvation.
Buddhism	560 B. C.	137,000,000	Selfishness the root of all suffering. Salvation through inner purity and self-discipline.
Confucianism	551 B. C.	250,000,000	Human nature essentially good, because divinely implanted.
Christianity	4 B. C.	557,000,000	God as love revealed by Jesus and interpreted by the Holy Spirit.
Mohammedanism	570 A. D.	220,000,000	There is but one God. Mohammed is his prophet. Man must obey.
Sikhism	1469 A. D.	3,000,000	The religion of the disciples of the one true God.

1. *Inclusiveness Characteristic of the Final Religion*

There is not one of the basic teachings of these living religions of the world which does not represent a positive gain in spiritual advance for the race. The final religion must contain them all, wedded into a beautiful and harmonious unity. The final religion will not become common by finding the particular aspect of truth which is present in all religions and regarding all else as commentary. The final religion will take account of the individual differences of the world's religious systems and will incorporate all of them. These differences have been purchased at too great a price to be lightly discarded. They will be prized highly as discoveries in spiritual adventure. All truth belongs to the final religion which therefore will become inclusive in the fine sense not only of toleration and mutual respect, but also of active sincere appreciation for its meanings, insights, and values.

But does not Christianity meet this test of inclusiveness? Does it not include every truth these living ethical religions cherish? It does and adds its own distinctive contribution as well. This is the conclusion of those who have studied the matter fully—a view in which I heartily concur.

The universal religion for example will need and will have in it affirmation of the immanence of God which Hinduism especially teaches as set forth above. The universal religion will also accept Jainism's self-renunciation as a condition of salvation, Buddhism's teaching of selfishness as the cause of misery and of relief from suffering through inner purity, and Sikhism's demand for discipleship of the One True God with trust in His name. It will also include Confucian-

ism's belief in the essential goodness of human nature as divinely implanted, Taoism's behest to walk in the divine way, with Shinoism's recognition of nature as a beautiful divine creation. Judaism's affirmation of obedience to the God of righteousness as the sure means of complete satisfaction, the universal religion will undoubtedly accept. The conflict of good with evil forces and the belief that cosmic righteousness aids the good in this conflict, which is Zoroastrianism's chief and fundamental contribution to religious conception, the universal religion will incorporate in its creed. And though Mohammedanism has supplied mankind with no new religious ideas, its unrelenting insistence on monotheism and on man's duty to submit to the omnipotent God as being the means of superlative satisfaction, the universal religion will accept as its own.

Every one of these basic ideas of the world's living ethical religions is part and parcel of Christianity. Everything therefore that is of permanent and abiding value for the spiritual aspiration of the race is revealed to us in Christianity and is heightened and glorified in its setting there. Every great soul-stirring utterance, passage, message, or truth of the bibles of these other religions is paralleled in our Bible and as nobly expressed there, if not, as the almost unanimous verdict has it, more nobly expressed there. It would appear that Christianity has vindicated its claim to be the all-inclusive revelation for all the religions of the world, that it includes within its teachings all that is really God's truth in each and everyone of them.

But Christianity can go further than that and claim that its teaching as to the great issues of life, for the solution of which men's hearts have cried out in every age and land, is not only the most satisfying that the

world has yet received, but it is so completely satisfying that it can reasonably be said to be final and ultimate in concept, but requiring the unfolding experience of man to comprehend it in all its joyous beauties and varied interpretations.

Christianity, we may say, therefore, meets the first requirement of the final religion, that it should be inclusive in its spiritual outlook, excluding no basic principle of life and for understanding God.

2. The Final Religion Must Be Concrete

But the final religion must in the second place be concrete, personal, experiential. Herein lies the vital difference between philosophy and religion. Philosophy is abstract. It universalizes its concepts. It is a synthesis of the ideas that particular groups of men accept with reference to ultimate values. There are various schools of philosophy, just as there are several religious systems. But philosophy of whatever school lacks dynamic. We may know all the principles of holy living and be paralytics in performance. But religion is nothing if it does not eventuate into life. It motivates, evaluates, dynamicizes, integrates living. It can do this only in the concrete. The sure and unfailing integrating principle relates itself not to abstract teaching, but to concrete person. The strength of Christianity is its Christ.

What other living religion can point to such an incarnation of its basic teachings? Where there was an individual founder he was manifestly in search of guiding principles for his life, and (how important this is!) he lived those principles only partially. His teaching was foundational, but it was not himself. But

Jesus was His teaching. He was a prophet, but different. His prophetic utterances were concrete personalizations. He illustrated His doctrine, or rather His doctrine emanated from His life. Christianity thus meets the requirement of concreteness in a unique and satisfying way. This points to its being accepted as the final religion.

3. The Final Religion Must Be Progressive

The third test which the final religion must meet is progressiveness. That is to say, it will not be final at all in any particular moment of time. This is a paradox, comparable to Jesus' teaching that we save our lives by losing them, or to that modern paradox of a fine Christian man known to the speaker, who affirms that he has saved only what he has given away. The final religion is in process. It is a becoming.

This fact of progress characterizes man's endeavor to understand the spiritual verities and make them functional in his life. Religions have too often become so enamored of a helpful revelation, that they have become solidified around it. Thereupon any suggestion that there might be a larger conception was branded as heresy. So satisfying was this new discovery, that it became identified with men's contemporary cosmological ideas and any suggestion that those ideas needed enlargement or revision was resisted forthwith as an impious attack on the espoused spiritual insight. Hence the warfare between science and religion, between psychology and religion, between social science and religion. Silly warfares!

But this static attitude is untenable philosophically and indefensible historically. The principle of progress

must be basic in the final religion, because that religion must account for all the facts of experience, and one certain fact is that mankind's conceptions of the spiritual verities have progressed and will continue to progress, because God is constantly broadcasting His larger truths for man's further enlightenment and insight.

"Just tune your soul till the wave-lengths chime,
For God is broadcasting all the time."

—*Charles Wharton Stork.*

Christianity is the only religion that incorporates this basic principle of progressiveness. God's Holy Spirit is our leader into all truth. Without this attitude toward life and experience, Christianity would become static and lose its claim to being the final religion. With God's Holy Spirit leading men into the progressive understanding of many things they cannot now bear (Jno. 16, 12), the third test of the final religion is met—the test which regards truth not as a final deposit, but as a growing unfolding, and that views all truth as of God. The end is not yet. God's truth goes marching on and His Holy Spirit leads the way to its discovery. We never inquire, if we truly understand Christianity, What did Jesus do? but rather, What would Jesus do? So does the Christian religion free man. It is thus the religion of spiritual giants, not of literalistic pygmies.

The fundamental ideas of Christianity, progressively interpreted as experience enlarges, seem to meet the intellectual, emotional, and volitional requirements of a satisfying program for life, but only as they are progressively interpreted. This principle of progressive interpretation applies also to the Christian view of God and of Jesus as His concrete revelation. It is

this progressive attitude which entitles Christianity rightfully to claim that it is the final religion.

Will Christianity Become the Final Religion?

That depends upon the attitude of its adherents toward its essentially progressive nature. If its adherents assume that already we have the ultimate truth of God, Christianity will become just a religion. If its adherents become satisfied with any particular method of ecclesiastical organization, Christianity is doomed. If its missionary zeal shall be directed to demonstrating the futility of the non-Christian faiths rather than to exemplifying Christianity as the most acceptable way of life, the way by which man's life is to be most largely promoted and its spiritual interests conserved, then Christianity must abandon its claim to be the final religion. If its would-be friends resent the judicial evaluation of its programs at home and abroad as impieties and insist that they want appropriations, not appraisals, contributions, not criticisms, then some other religious system must come to meet the demand of the human heart for a religion that will universally satisfy.

But if Christianity regards itself as a questing for the deeper things of God, for the larger understanding of His truth, for the new insights into duty and privilege and service; if it capitalizes the free spirit of man in his adventurous quest for the continuous unfolding of God's purpose; if it regards life as a becoming and not as an attainment; if it welcomes the new discoveries of the patient scientist in his effort to find the laws of God in the universe, of the artist in his ambition to interpret life, of the philosopher in his

aspiration to discover its deeper meanings, of the prophet in his luminous glimpses of the abiding values of experience; in short, if it regards itself as the progressive servant of the evolving abundant life, if it rejoices in nothing so much as sincere appraisals and constructive criticisms, then Christianity will become what Jesus meant it should—the final religion.

Is this too much to expect? Perhaps it is of this generation. But eventually, no. A good man said to me not so long ago that he hoped he would not live long enough to see all the churches united. Well, he will not, nor would any of us wish for the dead uniformity, which he conceived necessarily would underlie any union of the denominations. We do not want uniformity. We crave life, and Christianity promises it to us in more abundant measure. We have set such store by organization as a method of conserving the interests we esteem to be desirable, that we have sectarianized God's truth. We must repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance. Pious and platitudinous gestures of goodwill ending in mere talk will not meet the requirements.

Christianity and Life

Christianity arose to meet the spiritual needs of humanity. Other religions preceded it and still others have followed it. Mohammedanism (Islam) professes to have arisen to correct the deficiencies of Christianity. Our trinitarian (to them tritheistic) conception of God they decry and insist only on Allah, with Mohammed as His chief prophet. They could not understand the Trinity. They did not believe that the death of Jesus did honor to God, who demanded a price for His

willingness to forgive man. We have seen that this view of the atonement is not representative of Christianity and that true to its progressive principle, Christianity has purged itself of this concept. Today we believe that the death of Jesus reveals the heinousness of sin and the suffering that even now God endures when His children sin. And finally they claim that Mohammedanism champions the life of sobriety, forgetting that the principle of respect for personal values and their preservation and conservation, which is primary in Christianity, would eventually eradicate any practice hurtful to man's personality, whether it be the use of alcoholic liquors, smoking, excessive eating, prostitution, polygamy, or any other of the species of conduct which experience should indicate as militating against human values universally conceived. The principle of progress which inheres in Christianity will care for any weakness our present view of life permits. Its further principle of man as a free spiritual being working out his way of life under the divine guidance provides an additional safeguard against erroneous ideas. The final religion of man must have at its heart the ability to purge itself and to incorporate in its program more defensive ideals of life as they shall develop. But this is but another way of defining Christianity. Shall we not agree then, that it is embryonically final?

XI

DOES DEATH END ALL?

What Is Death?

Death is a fact, a universal fact. It is as characteristic of man as is his life. All men know they must die, and yet normally they wish to cling to life so long as is possible. Is death an enemy or a friend? Does man face inevitable annihilation, no matter how successfully he may live out his days? Does death end all? And what is death?

Death is, physically speaking, a chemical change, in which the elements of the body pass from animate to inanimate status. Death is the separation of body and spirit, in which the body returns to the earth and the spirit enters upon its truly spiritual existence, religiously speaking, according to Christian theology. Death is necessary to give the succeeding generation a chance to express their enlarging views of life and organization, progressively speaking. Death is the vestibule by which we pass from the circumscribed life of this world to the ampler life of the spirit, hopefully speaking. This world is the arena in which we train for the true spiritual race. This life is the portal to that race course. Herein we begin: there we develop. Of this we may be sure, that death is not evil. Whatever is necessary, is good, because God is good, and death appears to be one of the necessities.

The Four Reasons for Believing in Immortality

The Greek philosopher Plato gave an excellent summary of the reasons why men should believe in the immortal life, four in all. Only eternity, he argues in the first place, could provide adequate opportunity for righting the injustices and inequalities of this present life. Those who had done nobly by their fellows deserved their reward. Those who had misused them ought to be punished. The universality of the belief, in the second place, comforted him. He naively believed that all men accepted the idea. This has never been true, though the great majority have always longed for immortality, and do even yet. Thirdly, the dissatisfaction of men with this present life, in his judgment necessitated an opportunity for spiritual enlargement and development after the brief space of this existence. His fourth reason was decidedly metaphysical. The great philosopher viewed the soul as worthy of preservation. It did not occur to him to phrase it as we do today—that the universe would be lunatic not to preserve its finest product, personality, but in essence that is what he meant.

The Roman was not philosophical or speculative, but practical and pragmatic, in his views of immortality. The Romans were content to interpret what others had said. Cicero, Seneca, and others accordingly merely interpreted the Greek thought to their race, so that it became literally true that “captured Greece led the captor Rome captive.” The naivete of the Roman mind is excellently expressed in Cicero’s essay on “Old Age” in which he represents the venerable Cato as saying that he would believe in immortality despite the philosophers who undertook to disprove its tenability,

because it brought him satisfaction, and besides if he should be mistaken, the philosophers would not be there to deride him. It just seemed to him to be the better guess. Cato was in this the typical Roman.

But Christians do not have to guess. Jesus brought life and immortality to light through the gospel (II Tim. 1, 10). So fine a life as Jesus lived deserved to live on, His contemporaries believed. These men could not believe that He could die eternally. Our own conviction is that He lives and that we too shall live.

The Nine Arguments Against Immortality

But we must never call our hopes our facts. The mark of the real Christian is discerned in his willingness to look at a proposition from every angle. It is, therefore, proper for us to examine the arguments against immortality, which have seemingly multiplied in our day.

1. It is argued that the evolutionary process necessitates a mechanistic view of the universe, including man. The only immortality we can believe in, therefore, is the physical law of the conservation of energy. Personality and the spiritual values so-called are a delusion. We are cogs in the material mechanism of the universe and quite insignificant cogs at that, we are told. But, we retort, this mechanistic view of the universe is not even acceptable to all scientists today. The more excellent way, we affirm, is to regard evolution as God's method of creation, and the soul of man as not of a piece with the material elements of his body, but rather as temporarily dwelling in his body. Not a few physicists are beginning to find the counterpart of freedom in the behavior of the constituent protons and

electrons of the atom and to them the universe begins to appear more like a thought than like a machine. Even the so-called laws of nature they regard as statistical rather than as causal.

2. The conception of the supernatural is no longer tenable, they argue, and so the soul simply does not exist. The soul is a rationalized concept to account for the miraculous, they say. This is a specious argument, but it falls flat when its major premise is laid bare. To the theistic Christian, God is present in His world and actively concerned in its upbuilding. There are things we do not understand. But the existence of God and of man as a soul is in no way dependent upon the former and outworn conception of the supernatural, to which we do not subscribe. Spirit—whether in man or in God—and matter are both natural and can have relations to one another, even if ultimately they should be shown to be of one substance, for a man can have relations with his own spirit.

3. The intimate relationship existing between what we call consciousness and man's nervous system, they assert, renders the belief in the soul impossible, and so there can be no immortality for what does not exist. But the Christian view is that the entire body, including the brain or central nervous system, is the instrument of the soul. This soul, when an injury or other impairment of the brain occurs, is able to take over an unused section of the brain or one that had been supposedly "reserved" for another purpose, as we have seen, and mould it to serve as the vehicle of its expression. The body does to an extent limit the soul, just as an automobile conditions the chauffeur's rate of speed, but the soul is the commander-in-chief, and has an ex-

istence independent of the body, just as the chauffeur does of his car.

4. The historical criticism of the Bible makes it impossible, they say, to believe in the soul, for an inerrant Bible is the chief source of belief in immortality. How so? Did not the Bible grow, as we have seen, and is the knowledge of that process not strengthening to our view that God is in His world of things and of men continuously endeavoring the better to make His purposes clearer? The Bible takes both God and man for granted and is a record of the experience of certain men in their effort to understand God. It is not the fetish its critics imagine, nay, we may rather say, and truthfully too, our very love for the Bible strengthens our belief in man's immortality.

5. The inaccuracies and contradictions associated with the resurrection stories, we are told, manifestly discredit this doctrine for the Christian, who gets one of his greatest confirmations of the belief from this event. We frankly admit that witnesses often contradict each other, not maliciously, but because our physical senses do not give us the same report. The stories of the resurrection and of the days immediately following that marked the appearance of Jesus to His disciples, were written long years after the event. If they agreed in every particular, we would suspect collusion. The seeming inaccuracies and contradictions are to be accounted for on purely experiential grounds and in no true sense invalidate the truth of the event. Paul was right in the importance attached to the spiritual existence of Jesus following the Cross. If Jesus does not live, then we are of all men most miserable.

6. The doctrine of relativity which Einstein has promulgated for the physical world joined with

Dewey's instrumentalism in philosophy, they insist, makes it impossible for us to entertain longer any doctrine involving an objective spiritual or moral order. But we are wholly committed to progress. In moral and spiritual matters, we pit one outcome against another, we choose what appeals to us as the most tenable. We experiment with it. Sometimes our judgment is confirmed by experience. More often we have discovered that our chosen outcome needed enlargement. In this way new conceptions of God, of man, of the universe, of moral idealism have come to us. This is true moral and spiritual relativity. Einstein has but read into physics and Dewey but translated into philosophical language, not perfectly, it is true, what the progressive view of the moral and spiritual universe has always required, and, what is more, practised with more or less consistency.

7. A further argument they find against the doctrine of immortality in what they style the worthlessness, the insignificance of man. A false pride and an unwarranted assumption of personal worth, they argue, have encouraged man to advocate the perpetuity of his little self. A calm, dispassionate, philosophic view of man they assert, renders such egotism impossible, especially in view of the magnitude of the universe and the moral excellency men attribute to God. Man's true worth is not found in the size of his physical body, we have seen. It is rather to be found in his moral, his ethical, his spiritual nature and aspirations. Surely a sensible universe will preserve these, for these are they which relate us to the moral excellency of God Himself.

8. It is selfish. We admit it would be selfish if a person wished the everlasting life for himself only.

But since he thinks of it as characteristic of all men everywhere, as an inalienable attribute, it becomes not only personal or selfish, but social and altruistic. Surely there is no selfishness in the desire for the everlasting life when all men are included in its concept.

9. It minimizes this present life. But does it? Does it not rather enlarge it to believe that it is the portal, the vestibule to a spiritual existence that will last forever? What would really minimize this present life would be its limitation to the brief span of human existence. To express the confidence that our brief span of life here will introduce us to a continuing type of life—that is to magnify life, that is everlasting life's contribution to our thinking.

Endless Spiritual Development

And this brings us to the final matter of which we shall speak at this time, the endless development of man's soul. It is most important, though we might, if there were time, also speak of revelation, of inspiration, of prayer, of forgiveness, of love, as spiritual laws. However it is of one of the greatest of spiritual laws, of which we now speak, that the soul of man will endlessly develop. The destiny of man is an eternal destiny of progress, of fulfillment, of advancing concept in fellowship with God and of discovery of the inner source of His nature and of His universe, let us say. And we may continue by saying that no bare existence forever can satisfy the spiritual aspirations of the human heart. The Christian speaks not of the immortality of the soul, but of the everlasting life. Immortality is cold and bleak to men. The everlasting

life is warm and inviting to them. It is the everlasting life that wins the Christian heart.

What charm this concept has for us! What vistas it suggests for experience! The view that the spiritual world will be one of continuous music and worship has lost its appeal for Christians. Any type of monotony becomes painful to us. There is a rhythm in our life. For persons whose lot was one long drudgery, such a heaven of continuous music and worship no doubt had its attractions. But for the free soul, there must be opportunity for growth, for progress, for discovery, for enlarging experience. Our human history has been just this and we are perfectly justifiable in positing as an abiding verity, that the spiritual life is not only a continuous existence, but an ever-lasting experience of God and a progressive understanding of His nature and of His universe.

And so we answer the question propounding in the beginning of our lecture tonight by saying that certainly death does not end all. Death but opens the vestibule to an enlarged, a progressive, a spiritually satisfying living. Such is the witness of the Christian's faith, and calm in the confidence of this faith we radiantly face the future.

XII

DO WE NEED A PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE?

What is Philosophy?

It is fashionable now-a-days to berate creeds and philosophy has been classed with creeds in the popular mind. Yet creeds are the most effective controls of life. Every man has such an emotional attitude if he acts consistently or attitudes if his emotional centre of gravity is not in stable equilibrium. If this discrepancy is violently inconsistent, we attribute dual or triple personality, or even insanity, to the individual. The psychological explanation of such phenomena is, that the personality is not integrated in terms of a consistent life-purpose. But that is exactly what philosophy is. It is the synthesis, the unification, the integration into a consistent system of all the values of life. Manifestly we need individually to synthesize, unify, and integrate our experiences into a consistent system of values. When we have done this personally with our world, we have attained a philosophy of life. When we dynamicize this philosophy of life so that it motivates our conduct, we have raised philosophy to the status of religion. When we have motivated our life-philosophy in terms of the Christian way of life, we become Christians.

Two Philosophies of Life

For all practical purposes there are but two philosophies of life in our present-day world—the pagan

and the Christian—the materialistic and the spiritual, the selfish and the altruistic. We will briefly consider these two views of life in contrast. We shall thus see what the Christian philosophy of life involves. We shall study seven of these contrasts.

1. *Persons Versus Things*

The pagan philosophy looks at this present world. Its values are judged to be good. We cannot get along without things and so it places supreme emphasis upon them. Whatever interferes with the getting of things is to be done away according to this outlook on life. Nothing must impede a man in his ambition to gather the material goods of life, is its cardinal principle.

Christianity also looks at the world and it too pronounces it good, but its chief good is not things. Things for it have values only in their human uses. The supreme values are personal, and these must be conserved, preserved, promoted at whatever cost. No matter what interest collides with the development of personality, it must be done away. All things exist for persons. Persons must never be sacrificed to the increase, the production, the amassing of things. Christianity is the religion of personality.

2. *The Universal Versus the Particular*

The pagan philosophy is individualistic, particularistic. It is narrow and localized. Our capitalistic system, undoubtedly, has sometimes twisted personal values and their preservation into a perverted doctrine of "rugged individualism." "We believe in personality development," assert these capitalists with

their vested interests, "and nothing must be tolerated that abridges the free right of the individual to achieve self-realization." Beautiful sentiment, but what travesties it has perpetrated upon the values inherent in other persons than the self-complacent and economically entrenched rugged individualist! Individualism is selfish. Personality thrives in the social atmosphere. We do not indict rugged individualism as hopelessly pagan nor berate individual initiative, but we do invite their purification.

Christianity can tolerate no selfish indulgence. Its doctrine of the brotherhood of man hallows its principle of the supreme worth of personality by universalizing it. Whatever conserves, preserves, promotes personal values for all men, women, and children everywhere—that is the goal of personal living and of social cooperation. Neither industry nor profits nor government nor any other creature or force must be permitted to abridge the rights of persons universally related. Personality and brotherhood—these are the great pillars upon which rest the program of Christian philosophy.

3. *Love Versus Fear*

Pagan worship has always proceeded on the basis that it should make terms with the cosmic forces of life, sometimes conceived as God. Fear has lain at its root. The effort to appease and if possible to ally God with its program has been its animating purpose. We pagans want God on our side, and so we do abeissance to Him as the spiritual potentate of the universe. We are concerned to secure His support. We are not so

alert to discover His program nor consistently to pursue it.

But the Christian looks upon God not as a Being to be feared nor to be used, but to be loved. Our God is friendly to men and the universe is friendly. We have no reason or occasion to fear God. He is love and He seeks our love not through the compulsion of fear nor the bribery of favors received or granted, but through the appealing charm and attractiveness of voluntary, self-giving affection. Perfect love casteth out fear. It was a sad day for the Christian religion when it became enamored of Greek philosophy, having been rejected by the warmly humanistic advocates of the Hebrew orthodoxy. It was a sad day for Christianity because ere long it succumbed to Roman imperialism founded on force and in that situation largely lost its appeal to the affectional nature of man. Protestantism rebelled against the ecclesiastical imperialism of the Roman Church and, where it did not identify itself with the nation, became an intellectual individualism, which has resulted in the denominational, sectarian spirit so characteristic of the Western world. The social gospel has arisen to bring back into the Church the spirit of love and to discredit the deadening influence of force in the religious approach to life. Perhaps it could not have been otherwise. But the way of love is not the way of force nor of fear nor of spiritual bargaining, but rather the way of the complete liberation of man in his relation to God and his fellows.

4. *Giving Versus Getting*

The pagan is faced by the vicissitudes of fortune. He sets out to provide against them. Foolish is the

man who does not make provision for the rainy day, he thinks. Make hay while the sun shines, is to him no mere slogan. It is a settled life-principle. Thrift is sublimated for him into Godliness. And so he sets out to entrench himself in a situation that is marked by change. Sad has been his disillusionment in these latter days! His bonds, his stocks, his mortgages have become mere scraps of paper. His securities have changed their name to insecurities. Accustomed to affluence, the shock of its loss staggered his life. Suicide suddenly became popular. Men that concentrate on getting are gratefully forgotten by their fellows. Nations that aim at self-aggrandizement are bled white by devastating wars and their imperial pomp fades. Getting is its own defeat, as is all selfishness.

The Christian also looks at life. Its social obligation calls to his sense of brotherhood. He feels personally responsible for the sad plight of his brothers. He too sets out to acquire the goods of life—not that he may make himself secure in a situation characterized by change, but that he may have a surplus to share with his brother, to share with him not condescendingly, but as love shall dictate. The man who is rich toward God is generous toward his needy brother. The Christian philosophy of life produces millionaires of the spirit. Depressions may come, and depressions may go, but the philosophy of love, of sharing, goes on forever enriching the giver, the recipient, and God.

5. *Duty Versus Rights*

The pagan looks at life from inside his shell of self-interest. What one man gets another cannot have, and so he has worked out his doctrine of human or per-

sonal rights. He thus develops a system of rules for the conduct of life to hold the other fellow off, while the strong individual exploits whom and what he can. Insistence on rights produces discord, jealousy, hatred in private life. It produces wars in international life. What an ugly train of disasters, personal and social rights have produced! World economic and disarmament conferences fail. Why? Because the several nations are determined to secure their rights. Divorces multiply, homicides increase, bitternesses and heartaches are rife. Why? Because individuals are determined to have their rights.

Now this whole business is wrong, if Christianity is right. The only right I can ever have as a Christian is to see to it that my brothers everywhere have their rights. The great word for me as a Christian is not rights, but duty. And even duty must be interpreted as privilege, because privilege includes the principle of voluntarism along with the sense of obligation. Obligation voluntarily recognized because of the motivating principle of love—that is duty. As Robert E. Lee said, it is the sublimest word in the English language. It is also the greatest concept in the vocabulary of conduct. It is love expressed in social relationships.

6. *Service Versus Rulership*

What is greatness? "The ability to rule others," says the pagan. That man is greatest who can force his will upon the greatest number of his fellows, according to pagan philosophy. And nationally speaking, that nation is greatest that can exercise control over the most people and the largest area of the earth's surface. The ideally great nation would incorporate

into its political sovereignty all the ends of the earth. World-empire, however, is a fatuous dream that has fired the grandiose imaginations of many gifted peoples. Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Greece, Rome, Germany—all of them aimed at world domination, and failed. They did more, they ruined the finer sensibilities of their victimized peoples in the attempt. Lordly rule, whether individual or social, is doomed. Rulership is an unearned increment. It comes as an enriching by-product of experience. Directly sought, it becomes ashes. Directly sought, it destroys the finer sensibilities of mankind. Coming as an unearned increment of service rendered, it embellishes all life.

The very embodiment of this attitude is the Christian philosophy of life. He who would be greatest must be servant, forgetting his greatness in the joyous ministry of his service. Jesus came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. He was among His fellows as one who served. He would not permit His disciples to think of themselves as servants, but dignified them by calling them friends. The friendly ministry to life—what more exhilarating attitude! But that is exactly the Christian program, originating out of and supported by its philosophy of life. And this principle applies to nations as well as to persons. It applies to all the institutions organized to promote men's lives as well as to men themselves. What a glorious day it will be for humanity when the nations of the world give themselves to the promotion of the general welfare of mankind! Personal sainthood is not enough: there must be national sainthood too. Sainthood is life, personal and social, devoted to the universal welfare of mankind.

7. Cooperation Versus Competition

How illogical appears the pagan view of life with its insistence that competition is the fundamental law of human relationships! Arithmetically, it is folly to compete. Two persons can certainly accomplish more by working together than by pulling against each other. And yet the pagan insists that every man's interest is limited by every other man. He forgets that the material wealth which he aims to amass is a social product and that its administration involves social possession. He admits that his hand is against every man, but he repudiates responsibility for what he regards as a stern necessity. He did not, he insists, make life competitive. If his pagan philosophy of life is that of the jungle and if it is "red in tooth and claw," he is as much a victim as any other man, and he means to care for himself while he can. Progress can come only, as such men see it, by the upward climb of strong individuals. It is their duty to achieve success, and if, in their determined ascent to the place of power and security and progress, they must trample over the broken and bruised bodies of their fellows, they excuse themselves on the ground that the law of life is that "the fittest survive." To them the fittest always equals strongest.

There is no point at which the Christian philosophy of life joins issue more decidedly with the pagan, than right here. Christianity is the religion of progress and if progress is to be achieved only by the negation of the fundamental concepts of Christianity, we Christians must repudiate progress or repudiate our religion. But we will do neither. The law of progress is not selfishness, euphemistically called competition. Men do not rise to higher things by ruthless triumph over their

fellows. Such triumph debases men. It is not the prerogative of the strong to exploit the weak. Progress does not lie that way.

Even pagans will not follow out to logical completeness the gruesome and harrowing application of their philosophy. In the abstract they may assent to it, but in the concrete never. Let a loved one contract a dreaded disease. "Well," logically the pagan philosopher should conclude, "he is weak and not fit to survive. We regret his illness, but it is useless to oppose fate. Let him die." But what human being will act according to this view? Rather will the professed pagan go the limit in sacrifice for the restoration of his loved one. He will sell all that he has and expend it on behalf of the stricken member of his heart and home. And through the long hours of the night he will watch in the hope that he may yet do something to win back his loved one to health and strength. In such experiences a man's real philosophy of life is revealed. In such experiences the heart is tendered and life itself haloed by a sweet and gracious ministry.

Progress comes not by crushing out the weak, but by imparting to them new strength. It comes not through climbing to new heights of achievement over the bleeding and bruised forms of our weaker brothermen, but by lifting them up to the level of strength of the strong,—that we may all be vigorous with life and health together. So is fellowship enthroned. So is Christian brotherhood vindicated. So does the Christian philosophy of life triumph. In it is the hope of the world. In it is the Kingdom of God.

Philosophy and Personal Religion

But not unless and until this Christian philosophy of life becomes to me individually the way of living, will my religion become truly personal. The voluntary commitment of myself with all the talents at my command to the Christian philosophy as the dynamic, the motivating principle of my conduct—that is personal religion. The greatest force making for human and institutional redemption is this same Personal Religion. It shall shine “more and more unto the perfect day (Proverbs 4, 18),” of the coming of the Kingdom of God to dwell among men. Such is the goal of Personal Religion, whose dynamic is the propulsive power of devoted affection. So does Jesus become the Christian philosophy of life. Through His divine-human personality does Personal Religion become the motivation principle of wholesome and helpful living. So is life hallowed, enriched, conserved. So is progress in moral and spiritual aspiration assured.

Certainly we need a philosophy of life and if we are wise, we will aim at the achievement of the Christian philosophy of life in our personal experience and life.

APPENDIX

General Bibliography

Note: For each chapter, including the first, a bibliography is provided. The books listed aim to represent the major issues in controversial matters. It is hoped that the reader will read the bibliography *before* the text, so as not to be too much influenced in his judgment by the author's opinions. The Bible is cited first in each chapter and without number. This is as it should be. Its position in the bibliography is meant to suggest its primary importance as a source book for religion. Over the radio only the Bible references were given.—*The author.*

Chapter I. What is Personal Religion?

The Bible: Psalm 23, Ezek. 18, 4 and 20, Matt. 7, 21.

1. Bower, W. C., *Religion and the Good Life*. Abingdon, 1933.
2. Dewey, John, *A Common Faith*. Yale, 1934.
3. Harper, W. A., *Youth and Truth*. Century, 1927.
4. Hickman, F. S., *Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*. Abingdon, 1926.
5. Hughes, H. M., *Basic Beliefs*, Abingdon, 1929.
6. Lewis, Edwin, *Great Christian Teachings*. Abingdon, 1934.
7. Lyman, E. W., *The Meaning and Truth of Religion*. Scribner's, 1926.

8. Rall, H. F., *A Faith for Today*. Abingdon, 1936.
9. Soper, E. D., *What May I Believe?* Abingdon, 1923.
10. Wright, W. K., *A Student's Philosophy of Religion*. Macmillan, revised 1935.

Chapter II. How Shall We Think of God?

At the beginning of each bibliography after the first will be given the numbers of books previously listed that will be found helpful in solving the particular problem under consideration. Those cited in Chapter I that have special bearing on the present problem are: 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10.

The Bible. Consult the concordance under "God." Jno. 4, 24.

11. Brightman, E. S., *The Finding of God*. Abingdon, 1931.
12. Clark, W. N., *The Christian Doctrine of God*. Scribner's, 1910.
13. Haydon, A. E., *The Quest of the Ages*. Harper, 1928.
14. Hocking, W. E., *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*. Yale, 1912.
15. Horton, W. M., *Theism and the Modern Mind*. Harper, 1930.
16. Hume, R. E., *The World's Living Religions*. Scribner's, revised 1931.
17. Patten, A. B., *Can We Find God?* Doran, 1924.
18. Swain, R. L., *What and Where is God?* Macmillan, 1921.
19. Tillett, W. F., *The Paths That Lead to God*. Doran, 1924.

20. Wieman, Macintosh, Otto, *Is There a God?*
Willett, Clark and Co., 1933.

Chapter III. How Shall We Understand Jesus?

Books previously listed—5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, and 19.
The Bible: Consult the concordance under "Jesus"
and "Christ."

21. Bennett, John C., *Social Salvation*. Scribner's,
1935.
22. Blanchard, F. Q., *How One Man Changed the
World*. Pilgrim, 1929.
23. Bosworth, E. I., *The Life and Teaching of
Jesus*. Macmillan, 1924.
24. Case, S. J., *Jesus, A New Biography*. Chicago,
1927.
25. Denny, W. B., *The Career and Significance of
Jesus*. Nelson, 1933.
26. Klausner, J., *Jesus of Nazareth*. Macmillan,
1925.
27. Knudson, A. C., *The Doctrine of Redemption*.
Abingdon, 1933.
28. Schweitzer, A., *The Quest of the Historical
Jesus*. Macmillan, 1910.
29. Simkovitch, V. G., *Towards the Understanding
of Jesus*. Macmillan, 1921.
30. Stewart, George, *The Crucifixion in Our Street*.
Doran, 1927.

*Chapter IV. Do We Need the Holy Spirit in
Our Religion?*

Books previously listed—5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 19,
23, and 30.

The Bible: Consult the Concordance under "Holy Ghost," "Holy Spirit," "Spirit," "Spirit of Christ," "Spirit of God," I Jno. 5, 8. Eph. 4: 4-6.

31. Brightman, E. S., *Personality and Religion*. Abingdon, 1934.
32. Calhoun, R. L., *God and the Common Life*. Scribner's, 1935.
33. Clarke, W. N., *An Outline of Christian Theology*. Scribner's, 1899.
34. Fisher, G. P., *History of Christian Doctrine*. Scribner's, 1896.
35. Gore, C., *The Holy Spirit and the Church*. Scribner's, 1924.
36. Jones, Rufus M., *The Faith and Practice of the Quakers*. Doran, 1927.
37. McGiffert, A. C., *History of Christian Thought, Early and Eastern*. Scribner's, 1933.
38. McGiffert, A. C., *History of Christian Thought, West*. Scribner's, 1933.
39. Streeter, B. H., *The Spirit*. Macmillan, 1914.
40. Tillett, W. F., *Providence, Prayer, and Power*. Cokesbury, 1926.

Chapter V. How Shall We Regard Man?

Books previously listed—1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 22, 27, 30, 32, and 40.

The Bible: Psalm 8. Consult the Concordance under "Man."

41. Brightman, E. S., *Moral Laws*. Abingdon, 1933.
42. Harper, W. A., *Character Building in Colleges*. Abingdon, 1928.

43. Hartshorne, Hugh, *Character in Human Relations*. Scribner's, 1932.
44. Hartshorne and May, *Studies in the Organization of Character*. Macmillan, 1930.
45. Jacks, L. P., *The Revolt Against Mechanism*. Macmillan, 1933.
46. Lashley, K., *Brain Mechanisms and Intelligence*. Chicago, 1928.
47. Stevens, S. N., *Religion in Life Adjustments*. Abingdon, 1930.
48. Swain, R. L., *What and Why Is Man?* Macmillan, 1925.
49. Thomson, W. H., *Brain and Personality*. Dodd Mead, 1906.
50. Weatherhead, L. D., *Psychology and Life*. Abingdon, 1935.

Chapter VI. Does Man Need Salvation?

Books previously listed: 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16, 21, 32, 27, 40, 47, 48, and 50.

The Bible. Acts 16: 25-36. Consult Concordance under "salvation."

51. Barbour, C. E., *Sin and the New Psychology*. Abingdon, 1930.
52. Burkhardt, Roy A., *Guiding Individual Growth*. Abingdon, 1935.
53. Bushnell, H., *Christian Nurture* (Revised by Weigle). Scribner's, 1916.
54. Elliott, H. and Elliott, Grace L., *Solving Personal Problems*. Holt, 1936.
55. Holman, C. T., *The Cure of Souls*. Chicago, 1933.

56. Mackintosh, H. R., *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness*. Harper, 1927.
57. Stevens, G. B., *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*. Scribner's, 1905.
58. Tillett, W. F., *Personal Salvation*. Cokesbury, 1924.
59. Underwood, A. C., *Conversion: Christian and Non-Christian*. Macmillan, 1925.
60. Waterhouse, E. S., *What is Salvation?* Cokesbury, 1933.

Chapter VII. How Was the World Created?

Books previously listed: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 21, 39, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, and 59.

The Bible: Genesis, chapters 1 and 2, Psalm 19. John 1:1-5.

61. Barnes, H. E., *The Twilight of Christianity*... Vanguard, 1929.
62. Burt, E. A., *Religion in an Age of Science*. Stokes, 1929.
63. Coulter, J. M. and M. C., *Where Religion and Evolution Meet*. Macmillan, 1924.
64. Einstein, A., *Relativity*. Holt, 1920.
65. Huxley, J. S., *Religion Without Revelation*. Harper, 1927.
66. Mason, Frances B., *The Great Design*. Macmillan, 1934.
67. Millikan, R., *Evolution in Science and Religion*. Yale, 1927.
68. Morgan, C. L., *Emergent Evolution*. Holt, 1922.
69. Pupin, M., *The New Reformation*. Scribner's, 1928.

70. White, A. D., *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology*. 2 Vols. Appleton, 1910.

Chapter VIII. Do We Need the Church?

Books previously listed: 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 25, 28, 29, 42, 50, 51, and 55.

The Bible: Consult the Concordance under "Church." See especially Matthew 18, 20; Matt. 16:16-18; Acts 2, 47; and Eph. 5, 27.

71. Ainslie, Peter, *The Scandal of Christianity*. Willett, 1929.
72. Bower, W. C., *Religious Education in the Modern Church*. Bethany, 1929.
73. Braden, C. S., *Modern Tendencies in World Religions*. Macmillan, 1933.
74. Brown, W. A., *The Church, Catholic and Protestant*. Scribner's, 1935.
75. Douglass, H. Paul, *Church Unity Movements in the United States*. The Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934.
76. Harper, W. A., *An Integrated Program of Religious Education*. Macmillan, 1926.
77. Johnson, F. Ernest, *Economics and the Good Life*. Association, 1934.
78. Lotz, P. H., and Crawford, L. W., *Studies in Religious Education*. Cokesbury, 1931.
79. Smith, R. S., *New Trails for the Christian Teacher*. Westminster, 1934.
80. Soares, T. G., *Religious Education*. Chicago, 1928.

Chapter IX. Of What Value is the Bible?

Books previously listed: 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 16, 28, 32, 36, 41, 54, and 69.

The Bible: The entire Bible.

81. Case, A. T., *Liberal Christianity and Religious Education*. Macmillan, 1919.
82. Fosdick, H. E., *The Modern Use of the Bible*. Macmillan, 1924.
83. Gladstone, W. E., *The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*. Altemus, 1910.
84. Grant, F. C., *Form Criticism*. Willet, Clark, 1935.
85. Harrell, C. J., *The Bible; Its Origin and Growth*. Cokesbury, 1926.
86. Mathews, I. G., *Old Testament Life and Literature (Revised)* Macmillan, 1934.
87. Selleck, W. E., *The New Appreciation of the Bible*. Chicago, 1907.
88. Stewart, George, *Can I Teach My Child Religion?* Doran, 1929.
89. Wallis, Louis, *God and the Social Process*. Chicago, 1935.
90. Warfield, B. B., *Revelation and Inspiration*. Oxford, 1927.

Chapter X. Is Christianity the Final Religion?

Books previously listed: 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 41, 47, 50, 53, 54, 55, 71, 75, 80, 88, and 89.

The Bible: Phil. 2:6-11, Acts 17:19-34.

91. Baker, A. G., *Christian Missions and a New World Culture*. Willet, Clark, 1934.

92. Barclay, W. C., *The World Mission of the Christian Religion*. Cokesbury, 1934.
93. Fleming, D. J., *Contacts with Non-Christian Cultures*. Doran, 1929.
94. Haydon, E. A., *Modern Trends in World Religions*. Chicago, 1935.
95. Hutchinson, Paul, *World Revolution and Religion*. Abingdon, 1931.
96. Martin, A. W., *Comparative Religion and the Religion of the Future*. Appleton, 1926.
97. McAfee, C. B., *The Foreign Mission Enterprise and its Sincere Critics*. Revell, 1935.
98. Rethinking Missions, *A Layman's Inquiry After One Hundred Years*. Harper, 1932.
99. Speer, R. E., *Re-thinking Missions Examined*. Revell, 1933.
100. *The Christian Life and Message in Relation to the Non-Christian Systems of Thought and Life*. Vol. 1., Jerusalem Meeting of the I. M. C. International Missionary Council, 1928.

Chapter XI. Does Death End All?

Books previously listed: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 27, 41, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 56, 57, 60, 61, 62, 65, 70, and 78.

The Bible: I Cor. 15.

101. Abbott, L., *The Other Room*. Macmillan, 1905.
102. Baillie, John, *And the Life Everlasting*. Scribner's, 1935.
103. Bell, W. Cosby, *If a Man Die*. Scribner's, 1934.
104. Eddington, A. S., *Science and the Unseen World*. Macmillan, 1930.

105. Fosdick, H. E., *The Assurance of Immortality*. Association, 1918.
106. Halsey, D. P., *Evidence for Immortality*. Macmillan, 1931.
107. Keen, W. W., *Everlasting Life*. Lippincott, 1924.
108. Leuba, J. H., *Belief in God and Immortality*. Open Court, 1917.
109. Mathews, Shailer, *Immortality and the Cosmic Process*. Harvard, 1933.
110. Moore, C. H., *Ancient Beliefs in the Immortality of the Soul*. Longmans, 1931.

Chapter XII. Do We Need a Philosophy of Life?

Books previously listed: 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 31, 41, 42, 45, 47, 49, 61, 65, 77, 78, 94, 95, 98, and 109.

The Bible: Col. 2:6-9.

111. Brown, O. E., Kirkland, J. H., and Mims, E., *God and the New Knowledge*. Cokesbury, 1925.
112. Cabot, R. C., *The Meaning of Right and Wrong*. Macmillan, 1933.
113. Curry, Bruce, *Speaking of Religion*. Scribner's, 1935.
114. Hyde, W. D., *The Five Great Philosophies of Life*. Macmillan, 1911.
115. Neibuhr, R., *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. Scribner's, 1932.
116. Pringle-Pattison, A. S., *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*. Oxford, 1930.
117. Schweitzer, A., *Philosophy of Civilization*. Macmillan, 1933.

118. Streibert, M., *Youth and the Bible*. Macmillan, 1924.
119. Van Dusen, H. P., *The Plain Man Seeks for God*. Scribner's, 1933.
120. Winton, G. B., *Pleaders for Righteousness*. Cokesbury, 1929.

ELON COLLEGE LIBRARY



0 2927 0264768 9

ADT-
4637

